

HOW TO PREACH TO TEENS ABOUT
HOMOSEXUAL PRACTICE IN A TOLERANT WORLD

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF
GORDON-CONWELL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
DOCTOR OF MINISTRY

BY

LORNA P. GRAHAM

MAY 2012

To Our Triune God,

This is an offering.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
ABSTRACT.....	vi
Chapter	
1. IDENTIFICATION OF THE PROBLEM.....	1
2. THEOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK.....	9
3. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	42
4. PROJECT DESIGN.....	86
5. OUTCOME.....	100
Appendix	
1. WORD SEARCHES.....	107
2. QUESTIONNAIRE.....	110
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	114
VITA.....	121

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In honor of my grandparents Doris Satchell and Vernon Satchell:

Thank you for laying the ground work for my spiritual formation.

To Bishop Wellesley A. Blair:

Your burden for the Church influenced this thesis.

To Cherry Gorton:

Thank you for believing in me, staying with me and investing yourself in my life.

To everyone who has encouraged me in this project:

Thank you for your patience and support. It has been a long time coming.

ABSTRACT

God designed human sexuality to be complementary: male and female sexually oriented to each other. The man and the woman recognized their gender difference and sexual suitability for marriage and procreation. Sin violated that order. A homosexual alternative developed that rejects the relevance of gender, leaves God's image incomplete in human beings and distorts the sexual functions of God's design into something other than the intended purpose.

At the root of homosexuality is self-worship, as well as the idolatry of sex and sexuality. In early Middle Eastern civilization, homosexual intercourse was incorporated in pagan worship as sacrificial service to nature, sexual love and fertility. That ideology was an affront to God's claim to be the source of all provision. It challenges God's sovereign power over all blessings and robs him of worship and gratitude. For that reason God condemned homosexual practice in the Old Testament (Leviticus 18:22). The apostle Paul echoed that condemnation in the New Testament (Romans 1:17-32) and referred to those who engage in same-sex practice as immoral.

Youth culture in the United States has been targeted by homosexual activists. Television programs convey homosexual love in cartoons and sitcoms as "cool." This thesis study assesses the theological, psychological and scientific evidence in support of and in opposition to homosexual causation.

CHAPTER ONE

IDENTIFICATION OF THE PROBLEM

The Problem and its Setting

Homosexual and lesbian practice among youth is ever increasing in the United States. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) reported that for the period of 1994-1997 men having unprotected anal intercourse (UAI) with men and multiple sex partners increased from 23.6 percent to 33.3 percent.¹ The largest increase in this category was adolescent males in the 13-24 age group. The report further states that despite efforts to educate homosexuals against the danger of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) which is associated with men who have sex with men, the disease is on the rise.

Through 2004, young people under 25 years of age accounted for four percent, or 37,772 of the 944,306 estimated AIDS diagnoses in the United States, and two percent, or 10,582 of the 529,113 deaths as a result of the disease, were youths.² CDC reports that in 2004 alone there were 42,514 new AIDS diagnoses of which 5.1 percent were youths. As a result, the number of young people living with AIDS has increased by 42 percent since 2000. Annually, 56,300 Americans are infected with Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV), a sexually transmitted disease that causes AIDS. Young men between the ages of

¹ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), "Increases in Unsafe Sex and Rectal Gonorrhea Among Men Who Have Sex With Men, San Francisco, California, 1994-1997," (January 1999): 45, <http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/00056314.htm> (accessed February 3, 2012).

² CDC, "HIV/AIDS Among Youth," <http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/resources/factsheets/PDF/youth.pdf> (accessed February 3, 2012).

13 and 29 who engage in sex with men account for two-thirds of all HIV infections, CDC reports.³

The influx of mainstream soap operas like *Will & Grace*, *Desperate Housewives*, *Next*, and *Degrassi* (on Nickelodeon's Noggin Cable Network for kids), which depict handsome Caucasian young men romantically involved with the same sex, communicates a strong message to teens that homosexuality is not only normal, but it is chic and cool. During the daytime, Nickelodeon, with a viewership of 22 million, provides programs for toddlers and elementary school children and at a later time slot features *Degrassi* with homosexual and lesbian teen characters in intimate settings. Other television shows aimed at youth viewership such as *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* and *Dawson's Creek* also feature homosexual scenes. Orthodox Christian organizations accused the networks and Hollywood of conspiracy to promote the spread of homosexual practice among American youth through television and desensitizing society to homosexual behavior.⁴ Traditional Values Coalition accuses the networks of using main stream youth recreation to lure teens into a lifestyle that is biblically immoral.⁵

The Public schools are the next battle-ground for protecting children against homosexuality indoctrination. Homosexual movements such as Gay Lesbian Straight

³ CDC, "HIV and Young Men Who Have Sex With Men," (June 2011), http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/sexualbehaviors/pdf/hiv_factsheet_ymsm.pdf (accessed February 3, 2012).

⁴ WorldNetDaily.com, "TV show depicts teen 'gay romance – Mainstream, youth-oriented program breaks new ground," <http://www.wnd/2004/01/22899> (accessed February 3, 2012).

⁵ Traditional Values Coalition, "Nickelodeon Pushes Homosexuality to Teens," <http://traditionalvalues.org> (accessed March 14, 2012).

Education Network (GLSEN)⁶ have recruited and mobilized teens as pawns to push the homosexual agenda in the American public school systems through the establishment of Gay Student Alliance (GSA) clubs for gay, lesbian and transgender students and to promote gay tolerance.⁷ GSA clubs in high schools have increased from 100 in 1997 to over 4,000 in 2008. One in every 10 high schools across the nation has been recruited, GLSEN reports.⁸ The *modus operandi* is to make homosexual practice normal, accepted, and to integrate homosexuality into the curriculum of schools at the expense of young adolescents who are still unsure of their personal identity, much less their sexual orientation.⁹ In 2000 the Massachusetts Department of Education sponsored a statewide conference to establish more GSA in lower grades. The workshops involved homosexual role plays with students as young as 12 years of age who were given graphic instructions on how to perform oral and anal sex by activist teachers in attendance.¹⁰ Contraceptives were provided to 12 and 13 year olds, and students were told they could make an

⁶ Gay Lesbian Straight Education Network is a gay teacher group founded in 1990 that transformed into GLSEN.

⁷ GSANetwork, "Empowering Youth Activists to Fight Homophobia and Transphobia in Schools," <http://www.gsanetwork.org/about-us> (accessed March 7, 2012).

⁸ John Cloud, "The Battle Over Gay Teens," *Time*, October 10, 2005, 43-51.

⁹ Louis Sheldon, *Traditional Values Special Report* 18, no. 11, "Homosexuals Recruit Public School Children," 7, <http://www.docstoc.com/docs/59930651/How-Homosexuals-Recruit-Public-School-Children> (accessed March 24, 2012).

¹⁰ Brian Camenker and Scott Whiteman, "Students Given Graphic Instruction In Homosexual Sex," *Massachusetts News*, The FISTGATE Report, 2000, http://www.massnews.com/past_issues/2000/Schools/fistrep.htm (accessed March 14, 2012). Also read in *Massachusetts News*, The FISTGATE Report, "Governor's Commission Lies Again About Safety and Suicide," published July, 2000 by Brian Camenker and Scott Whiteman. Kevin Jennings, Executive Director of Gay and Lesbian Straight Teacher's Network, revealed how he used "safety" to "delude" Governor Weld and state legislature into adopting the homosexual agenda for schools in Massachusetts: "If the Radical Right can succeed in portraying us as preying on children, we will lose. We seized upon the opponent's calling card 'safety' and explained how homophobia represents a threat to students' safety by creating a climate where violence, name-calling, health problems, and suicide are common. Titling our report 'Making Schools Safe for Gay and Lesbian Youth,' we automatically threw our opponents onto the defensive and stole their best line of attack. Framing your community must be linked to universal values that everyone in the community has in common," http://www.massnews.com/past_issues/other/govcm2.htm, (accessed February 3, 2012).

“informed decision” whether to use condoms. There were no discussions on consequences. Protests from parents resulted in the firing of the teachers.

Inroads have also been made by Point Foundation, a national homosexual movement. They offer full and partial educational scholarships in the amount of \$3,000-\$40,000 a year to some 5,000 gay students to encourage them to “come out” and prove their commitment to gay causes.¹¹ Further politicizing of teens in public schools makes use of the legal system in forcing institutions to amend their constitutions to allow for same-sex acceptance. This includes a redefinition of the nuclear family to embrace homosexual parents as correspondingly equal to their heterosexual counterparts. The March 12, 2006 issue of the *Los Angeles Times* reported that high school students across the state of California staged rallies and compelled schools through the legal system and political activism to allow for the tolerance of homosexuality.¹² A lesbian teen at Garden Grove High School had sued her school for her right to ‘make out’ with her girlfriend on campus. Students at Bakersfield High School sued their school district for prohibiting the school newspaper from printing articles about homosexuality. The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of California and the National Center for Lesbian Rights sued the Los Angeles Unified School District on behalf of the students of Washington Prep High School and the Gay-Straight Alliance Network for the inclusion of education and tolerance for homosexuality. Los Altos High School’s Gay-Straight Alliance campaigned for two years for the City Council to promote a Gay Pride Day. In May 2006, the council

¹¹ Cloud, “Battle,” 43-51.

¹² Seema Mehta, “Gay Teens Are Using the System,” *Los Angeles Times*, B.1., March 12, 2006, <http://www.articles.latimes.com/2006/mar/12/local/me-gayteens12> (accessed February 3, 2012).

caved in after much pressure from the gay-rights activist group.¹³ Kevin Jennings sees his homosexual movement (GLSEN) in high schools as a victory because pre-teens and teens are more sexually adventurous, promiscuous, confused and vulnerable: “This is the generation that gets it,” he remarked in an interview.¹⁴

Kindergarten, middle and high school students are at risk when public schools carry out the homosexual agenda under the radar and introduce into their curriculum books with homosexual themes without parental awareness.¹⁵ Students exposed prematurely to homosexuality through explicit and graphic homosexual sex education and pressured into identifying their sexual preference are at risk.¹⁶ Teens adopted into homosexual homes where they are taught that gender is irrelevant are at risk. The problem is not that same-sex couples are unfit in terms of their ability to nurture and provide a loving home. Rather, the redefinition of the biblical structure of the family and the indoctrination of a vast percentage of poor, vulnerable children from early childhood leads to the acceptance of a lifestyle without a proper understanding of any consequences. Teaching that same sex relationships are normal and an appropriate lifestyle choice without discussing consequences of such behavior is dangerous. A report released by the

¹³ Wyatt Buchanan, “City Council OKs Gay Pride Parade,” *City of Los Altos*, <http://www.sfgate.com> (accessed February 3, 2012).

¹⁴ Cloud, “Battle,” 45.

¹⁵ Tracy Jan, “Parent Rips School Over Gay Story Book,” *Boston Globe*, April 20, 2006. A Massachusetts 2nd grade teacher criticized for reading a fairy tale book *King & King* promoting “gay marriage” to her class sparks a nationwide controversy. A year ago the same school exposed 5 year olds to a book depicting homosexuality, transgenderism and gay families.

¹⁶ Allie Martin and Jody Brown, “9th Circuit: Parents Have No ‘Fundamental Rights’ In Their Children’s Sex Ed.” *AgapePress*, November 3, 2005.

National Adoption Information Clearinghouse estimated that in 1990 six to ten million children were being raised in homosexual and lesbian households.¹⁷

The fact of the matter is the homosexual lifestyle is extremely risky. The journal *AIDS* reports that men who engage in anal and oral-anal intercourse are at a greater risk of contracting AIDS, which is linked to a horde of “bacterial and parasitical sexually transmitted diseases, including Human Papillomavirus (HPV).”¹⁸ Interestingly, *The Washington Blade*, a homosexual newspaper, reported excerpts of Dr. Richard Zmuda’s findings in “Rising Rates of Anal Cancer for Gay Men” that HPV has infected over 90 percent of HIV-positive gay men and 65 percent of HIV-negative gay men.¹⁹ The virus, a collection of more than seventy types of viruses that can infect the genitals, throat and anus can lead to cancer according to the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences²⁰ and the National Cancer Institute.²¹ It is reported that more than 20 of the viruses produced by HPV are incurable. The CDC reports that sexually transmitted diseases (STD’s) continue to be a problem for homosexuals. Gonorrhea among men who have sex with men (MSM) increased from four percent in 1998 to 19.6 percent in 2003.²² According to the CDC, “HIV and AIDS have taken a heavy toll in the United States

¹⁷ National Adoption Information Clearing House, “Gay and Lesbian Adoptive Parents: Resources for Professionals and Parents,” http://www.childwelfare.gov/pubs/f_gay/f_gay.pdf (accessed February 3, 2012).

¹⁸ *AIDS*, <http://www.aidsonline.org> (accessed March 6, 2012).

¹⁹ Richard A. Zmuda, “Rising Rates of Anal Cancer for Gay Men,” *Cancer News* (August 17, 2000), http://www.cancerlinksusa.com/cancernews_sm/Aug2000/081700analcancer (accessed February 3, 2012)

²⁰ National Institute of Environmental Health Services, <http://www.niehs.nih.gov/health/docs/cancer-enviro.pdf> (accessed February 3, 2012).

²¹ National Cancer Institute, <http://www.cancer.gov/cancertopics/pdq/prevention/cervical/Patient/page2/> (accessed March 27, 2012).

²² CDC, “HIV/ AIDS among Men Who Have Sex with Men.”

among men who have sex with men.”²³ Statistics show as of 2004, 300,000 MSM died from AIDS.²⁴ Between 2006 and 2009 gay and bisexual men with HIV are estimated at 580,000, that is 49 percent of all people living with the virus.²⁵ Other sources such as The Gay, Lesbian Medical Association (GLMA) reported that physicians in large cities have identified Hepatitis A, B and C among men who have sex with men. The infections were contracted through fecal ingestion during sex, bodily fluid transfer and shared drug needles.²⁶

Another fact is that the suicide rate among gay teenagers accounts for one-third of all teen suicidal deaths.²⁷ Alfred Kinsey in *The Kinsey Report* claims that since homosexual teens account for 10 percent of the teen population, it is probable that they are 300 times more likely to kill themselves than heterosexual teens, due to social, personal and sexual identity struggles resulting in a low self-esteem.²⁸

The Purpose of This Project

The purpose of this thesis-project is twofold. First, it is to present the facts to teenagers, particularly those within the public school context, that homosexual behavior is neither chic nor cool nor normal. There are risks involved with such behaviors, although this is a perspective which is shunned today.

²³ CDC, “HIV/ AIDS among Men Who Have Sex with Men.”

²⁴ CDC, “HIV/ AIDS among Men Who Have Sex with Men.”

²⁵ CDC, “HIV and AIDS Among Gay and Bisexual Men,” September 2011, <http://www.cdc.gov/nchhstp/newsroom/docs/FastFacts-MSM-FINAL508COMP.pdf> (accessed March 27, 2012).

²⁶ Gay and Lesbian Medical Association, *Hepatitis*, <http://www.glma.org/hepatitis/whatis> (accessed March 27, 2012).

²⁷ Massachusetts Department of Education, “2001 Youth Risk Behavior Survey Results,” <http://www.doe.mass.edu/cnp/hprograms/yrbs/01/results.pdf> (accessed February 3, 2012).

²⁸ The Kinsey Institute, <http://www.kinseyinstitute.org/resources/sexlinks.htm> (accessed February 3, 2012).

The second purpose of this thesis-project is to provide teachers of the Word of God with strong expository biblical materials for addressing sexuality in teaching and preaching. As salt savors food, so the Christian Church is the life-preserving agent of the world. The Church cannot be a silent bystander as states pass laws that impose upon Christianity's fundamental beliefs about sexuality and that jeopardize the lives of children. The voice of the Church must cry aloud at the 'city gates' against homosexual practice and promote sexual abstinence among teens.

Target of This Project

This thesis-project will address theologically how homosexual behavior violates the law of God. The end product of this project will be a series of two seminars that can be used as a teaching archetype for pastors, Bible college professors, and seminarians to gain insight into how to delicately approach the homosexual agenda through a biblical exposition of scripture.

The Need for This Project

The Church is the center of the community, the beacon of light, and must continue to be so in a world that is spiritually dark. The Church is a place where, in times of national trauma, communities and presidents turn for counsel, prayer and healing. In the aftermath of 9/11 New York City sponsored a memorial prayer service for the victims and invited clergy members from various faith organizations to respond to the fears and physical and spiritual stress of the community through prayer and support. The Church is relevant and needs to be prepared to have a religious conversation on homosexuality so it can provide emotional, psychological and spiritual healing to homosexuals and build a welcoming, but non-affirming community.

CHAPTER TWO

THEOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

A wide array of books and journals has been written by religious as well as secular scholars on homosexuality based on Judeo law and ethics. Some articles are influenced by orthodox Christian faith whose assessments are biblically driven toward a traditional family value system. The belief structure is that a person can have an inclination or a desire towards homosexual practice but to act out the desire is a matter of choice. Homosexuality is perceived as an expression of sinful human nature and change, or healing, comes through the combination of confession, salvation and Christian counseling.¹ Other commentaries are authored by self-avowed homosexuals who are also of a Christian persuasion. They are of the opinion that mainstream Christian denominations have misunderstood the scriptures concerning same-sex copulation. As a result key biblical narratives such as Sodom's destruction in Genesis 19:1-11, the Holiness Code in Leviticus 18:22, and the apostolic injunction in Romans 1:26-27 that negatively reference same-sex intercourse are used to condemn all homosexual activity without exception, even to homosexuals who are in loving, long-term, monogamous relationships and those persons who have an innate homosexual orientation. Their belief is that homosexual practice, as presented in the Old Testament and New Testament, was restricted in its historical context to gang rape, archaic Jewish sex laws and excess passion.

Pastor and advocate for homosexuality, Mel White, in *What the Bible Says and Does Not Say About Homosexuality* argues that lack of due diligence in biblical study and

¹ James Dobson, *Dr. Dobson Answers Your Questions* (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 1980), 452- 453.

research by mainstream churches has done a disservice to gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender (GLBT) Christians based on the following premises:

- Misinterpretation of scripture to support homosexual bias.
- The Bible is silent about homosexual behavior and indicates no prejudice against homosexual orientation as it is understood today.
- The Bible is about God and not human sexuality.²

Based on these premises this chapter will seek to explore diligently the Bible's stance on homoeroticism, how the Bible interprets it, and how it functions in both the Old and New Testament eras. The objective is to narrow the gap between the intent of the biblical writer's message and the reader's interpretation. An examination of the region's history and customs and the text's linguistic construction is necessary to gain a deeper insight and appreciation into the message the biblical author wanted to convey. Sensitivity to the mood of the characters, conversation tone, and scene script will be considered against that cultural backdrop from which the personality of the story emerges.

Misinterpretation of Scripture?

The Story of Sodom – Genesis 19:1-14

The story of Sodom and Gomorrah unfolds in Genesis 19 when two angelic beings, appearing in male form, were sent by God to investigate the sinful happenings in Sodom. When they arrived in the city, Lot, unaware of who they were, invited the male guests into his home. Late that night his house came under siege by the city's townsmen who threateningly demanded that Lot turn out his male guests for their knowledge: "Where are the men which came in to thee this night? Bring them out unto us, that we

² Mel White, *What the Bible Says and Does Not Say About Homosexuality*, <http://www.soulforce.org/article/homosexuality-bible> (accessed March 14, 2012).

may know them” (Genesis 19:4-5, KJV). He and his household perceived their intent “to know” as wicked. Lot went outside, shut the door behind him and implored the townsmen, “Do not do so wickedly” (19:7). His refusal to concede to their demand leads him to negotiate his virgin daughters as conciliation. He begged the townsmen to accept his offer: “I have two daughters which have not known a man; let me, I pray you, bring them out unto you, and do ye to them as is good in your eyes: only unto these men do nothing for therefore they came under the shadow of my roof” (19:8). They rejected Lot’s proposal and ordered him to “stand back” from the door or they would do “worse” to him than what they had planned for his guests (19:9). They attacked Lot with an attempt to break down the door. Lot backed up and the angels pulled him into the house with them, shut the door and struck the men with blindness. The narrative presents a tumultuous atmosphere, filled with emotional tension, fright and impending peril that only angels could resolve. Twice was the door shut in rejection of their pursuit “to know.”

Genesis 19 clearly identifies the following realities: homosexual activity was in vogue in Sodom and the angels understood that the Sodomites’ desire “to know” them meant carnal knowledge and not a friendly “meet and greet” session. Both angels disinclined to offer themselves by defiantly shutting the door. Also, heterosexual rape appears to have a lesser divine consequence than consensual or non-consensual same-sex intercourse. More than likely Lot was faced with two evils: hand over his male guests to be sexually abused by men or sacrifice his virgin daughters for their abuse. He chose the lesser evil. It is fair to establish that since same-sex intercourse has its roots in idolatry and was worthy of capital punishment in Israel, Lot’s outrage and reluctance to entertain the townsmen’s desire was due to his religious conviction and oriental ethics. Not to

acknowledge these pertinent particulars would prejudice the story. The Old and New Testament records of the event are in harmony and should be studied not in isolation, but together. White claims, “We must be open to new truths from the scripture,” but “new truths” are divinely revealed and always align with the scriptures.

At the center of the theological debate is the Hebrew verb *yada* which means “to know.” It is used 947 times in the Old Testament to express either a cognitive awareness or an experiential knowledge of a person.³ In 14 instances carnal desire of sexual intercourse is inferred.⁴ On two of those occasions a male was both the subject and object of homosexual sodomy.⁵ Contextually, what does “to know” mean in the Sodom narrative? What kind of knowledge was implied? Proponents of homosexuality are passionate that only a friendly acquaintance was sought. Opponents of homosexuality are equally passionate that same-sex intercourse, whether consensual or not, was at the center of the discourse. Scholars have wrestled with the correct conjecture and have presented varied interpretations, but ultimately Lot’s understanding of the townsmen’s intent is what is significant. An intelligent assessment can be ascertained by concentrating on the mood of the scene, vocal tonality of the characters and conversation, and the behavioral response of the people involved.

³ *The New Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*, s.v. “Yada.”

⁴ Francis Brown, et al. *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2000), 393-394. See the following biblical texts: when a male was the subject of sex - Genesis 4:1, 17, 25; 24:16; 38:26; 2 Samuel 1:19; Judges 19:25; 1 Kings 1:4; when a woman was the subject of sex - Genesis 19:8, Numbers 31:17, 18, 35; Judges 11:39, 21:11, 12; when a man was the subject and object of sexual intercourse - Genesis 19:5 and Judges 19:22.

⁵ Brown, *Lexicon*, 394. Brown compares the Sodom and Gomorrah story in Genesis 19:5 to a similar narrative in Judges 19:22. A man and his concubine were guests of a resident in the city of Gibeah. The townsmen invaded the residence and pounding on the door they demanded to the owner, “bring out the man so we may know him.” Again, women were offered as substitutes.

White skirts around the theological nuance “to know” and he does not make sex or sexuality the subject of his argument. He holds to the notion that Sodom’s destruction was not about sex, but the failure of each citizen to be neighborly.⁶ White focuses primarily on the social and economic injustice that existed. The wealthy lived an extravagant suburban lifestyle that was materialistic, self-seeking and arrogant. They were sadistic towards immigrants, lacked compassion for the poor and were impious towards God who was the source of their prosperity, says White.⁷ This view was popular throughout classical Jewish documents. Though the presence of homosexuality was never disputed in Rabbinic teachings it certainly was not illuminated as the cause for Sodom’s destruction. The theme of the narrative has always been the inhospitality of the city’s people towards strangers. *The Babylonian Talmud: Tractate Sanhedrin* recorded:

The men of Sodom waxed haughty only on account of the good which the Holy One, blessed be He, had lavished upon them. They said: Since there cometh forth bread out of [our] earth, and it hath the dust of gold, why should we suffer wayfarers, who come to us only to deplete our wealth. Come, let us abolish the practice of travelling in our land...

Now, they had beds upon which travellers slept. If he [the guest] was too long, they shortened him [by lopping off his feet]; if too short, they stretched him out. Eliezer, Abraham's servant, happened to go there. Said they to him, ‘Arise and sleep on this bed!’ He replied, ‘I have vowed since the day of my mother's death not to sleep in a bed.’

A certain maiden gave some bread to a poor man, [hiding it] in a pitcher. On the matter becoming known, they daubed her with honey and placed her on the parapet of the wall, and the bees came and consumed her. Thus it is written, And the Lord said, The cry of Sodom and Gomorrah, because it is great...⁸

⁶ White, *What the Bible Says and Does Not Say*, 11.

⁷ White, *What the Bible Says and Does Not Say*, 11-12. The Old Testament text, Ezekiel 16:48-49 was a key source for White’s information.

⁸ *The Babylonian Talmud: Tractate Sanhedrin*, 109a.

Josephus in *Jewish Antiquities* wrote:

The Sodomites, overweeningly proud of their numbers and the extent of their wealth, showed themselves insolent to men and impious to the Divinity, insomuch that they no more remembered the benefits that they received from Him, hated foreigners and declined all intercourse with others. Indignant at this conduct, God accordingly resolved to chastise them for their arrogance, and not only to uproot their city, but to blast their land so completely that it should not yield neither plant nor fruit whatsoever from that time forward.⁹

The *Genesis Rabbah* tells a story of two girlfriends. One was burned to death because she responded to the need of the other. God heard her cry and vindicated her death:

Two girls, who went down to draw water from the well. One said to her friend, Why are you pale? The other said, 'all the food is gone from our house and we are ready to die.' What did the other do? She filled the jug with flour and exchanged it for her own. Each took the one of the other. When the Sodomites found out about it, they took the girl (who had shared the food) and burned her. Said the Holy One, blessed be He, Even if I wanted to keep silent, the requirement of justice for a certain girl will not allow me to keep silent...¹⁰

Walter Brueggemann in *Genesis Interpretation* would not attribute homosexuality to Sodom's sin either and discouraged that popular ideology among scholars. He feels the townsmen's act "to know" is subjective to various theological thinking and inferences can be made to either "gang rape" or "a general disorder of a society against God."¹¹ He leans towards the latter for he believes that Sodom's destruction was an accumulation of sins without mentioning homosexuality specifically. The biblical writer was silent concerning consensual "private acts of sodomy or homosexual acts,"¹² he says.

⁹ Josephus IV, *Jewish Antiquities, Books I-IV*, 194-195, trans H. St. J. Thackeray (London, England: William Heinemann Ltd, 1930), 95-97.

¹⁰ Jacob Neusner, *Confronting Creation: How Judaism Reads Genesis* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1991), 185.

¹¹ Walter Brueggemann, *Genesis Interpretation* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2010), 163-164.

¹² Brueggemann, *Genesis Interpretation*, 164.

Revisionist theologian Derrick Bailey in *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition* and John McNeil in *The Church and the Homosexual* appropriate a literalistic view of the text which is common among pro-homosexual advocates. They also argue that the narrative has no sexual connotation, but everything to do with inhospitality. Both scholars state that Lot's citizenship status and civic privilege precluded him from entertaining guests in exchange for his own tolerance and protection in the city. He breached oriental social ethics by taking in the visitors for an excessive amount of time and not sharing his acquaintance with the community. Doing so eventually devalued the importance of the society in which he lived. That provocation coupled with bribing the authorities was a testament of his flawed character, says Bailey.¹³ According to the authors the "knowledge" the townsmen sought was cognitive and nothing more. However, they admitted to an attempted sexual assault, but blamed Lot for inciting it.

John Boswell in *Christianity, Social Tolerance and Homosexuality*, hints at homosexual rape as the theme of Sodom's story, though, much to his disappointment, that idea has not been academically expounded and, in fact, has historically gone unnoticed by scholars perhaps because of insufficient data or uncertainty surrounding male-on-male rape, he says.¹⁴ But he too has failed to provide any intellectual data that support his view. Instead, Boswell defers to the alternative notion constructed by Bailey and McNeil and agrees that the only sexual connotation in the story was Lot's bribery to

¹³ Derrick S. Bailey, *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition* (London, England: Longmans, 1955), 4-5; J. J. McNeil, *The Church and the Homosexual* (Kansas City: Sheed, Andrews and McMeel, 1976), 42-50.

¹⁴ John Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance and Homosexuality* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 93.

offer his daughters for sexual use: “there was no sexual interest of any sort in the incident” and that the townsmen’s desire “to know” meant a friendly awareness.¹⁵

Boswell alludes to the popular viewpoint that Sodom was judged for pride and social ethics violation. He is resolute that the word “homosexuality” is not present in the scriptures or mentioned in any language—English, Hebrew or Arabic—prior to the nineteenth century. He feels that the Latin vernacular “sodomita” which closely represents the English meaning of the term homosexual, cannot be assigned concretely to male-on-male sex since any atypical sexual expression, including heterosexual anal sex, oral sex and sexual contact with animals, also falls into that category.¹⁶

Victor Hamilton in *The Book of Genesis* dismisses the inhospitality and rape theories for he believes that when the crust of the story is peeled away the nature of Sodom’s sin is revealed at the core of which is homosexuality. For those who hold the view that God prohibits only homosexual rape, Hamilton argues that the scripture does not draw a distinction between private homosexual relations and homosexual rape. Rather it places sexual inferiority and abhorrence on homosexual acts.¹⁷ Furthermore, in his view the Old Testament reserves language that describes incidents of rape with phrases like “seized,” “humbled,” “lay hold of” and “forced,” all of which exhibit aggression, and that the Hebrew verb “to know” is free of nuance: “Nowhere in the OT does the verb *yada*

¹⁵ Boswell, *Christianity*, 94-95.

¹⁶ Boswell, *Christianity*, 92-93.

¹⁷ Victor Hamilton, *The New International Commentary on the Old Testament: The Book of Genesis Chapters 18-50* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995), 34.

have the nuance of “abuse” or “violate.” The OT uses unmistakable language to relate rape incidents (See Genesis 34:2 and Deuteronomy 22: 25-27).¹⁸

Gordon Wenham in *Word Biblical Commentary* connects widespread homosexual activity in Sodom to the social construct of the city and Sodom’s sin. Wenham states that the conventions of ancient oriental hospitality to make provision for and secure the safety of one’s guest were a sacred duty. Lot abided by that principle. The Sodomites’ proposed gang rape upon his guests would have violated societal mores by which they were entitled to be protected from any form of abuse while visiting under Lot’s roof.¹⁹

Wenham suspects that consensual same-sex intercourse was practiced among the surrounding pagan nations, but rape showed unrestraint and a breach of social ethics.²⁰ Wenham points out that the male guests’ entrance to Sodom was not secretive, but through the public gateway where they were publicly welcomed by Lot. The townsmen forfeited the opportunity to “meet and greet” them in daylight and chose instead a late night mob-style attack. Those actions created suspicion of sexual intent, according to Wenham.²¹

Gerard Von Rad in *Genesis, A Commentary* finds Wenham’s interpretation of the text credible based on Sodom’s geographical characteristics and historical background.²² Sodom was one of many Canaanite cities situated along Canaan’s southern border where

¹⁸ Hamilton, *Commentary*, 34-35.

¹⁹ Gordon J. Wenham, *Word Biblical Commentary vol. 2, Genesis 16-50* (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1994), 55-56.

²⁰ Wenham, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 55.

²¹ Wenham, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 55.

²² Gerhard Von Rad, *Genesis, A Commentary* (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster, 1956), 212.

male anal intercourse was trendy and an acceptable carnal deviant practice in Canaanite civilization since antiquity. The Canaanites lacked moral restraint towards the migrating Israelites who were bound by God's law, says Von Rad.²³ They were described as despoiled because of their idolatrous practice which involved offering "erotic and orgiastic" rites to the fertility gods Baal and Astarte, says Von Rad.²⁴ According to H. A. Hoffner's article "Symbols for Masculinity and Femininity" part of that ritual included bestiality, homosexuality, bisexual and transvestite activity.²⁵ B. A. Brooks, in his article "Fertility Cult Functionaries in the Old Testament," explains that the meaning behind ritual intercourse was to secure economic prosperity and assist the gods in the reproduction of human life. The Canaanites believed it would renew the earth with rain that would produce a plentiful agricultural harvest:

Persons dedicated to the gods who were officials of the cult were sought, specially at festivals, by laity who sincerely believed that intercourse with these persons would cure sterility of human beings, of animals and of the land, and that by actual union with the human representatives of the deity one could assist the gods in bringing prosperity to mankind.²⁶

Von Rad feels that given the backdrop of ancient near eastern mores the behavior of the men of Sodom towards Lot and his male guests was consistent with Canaanite tradition and civilization.²⁷ Lot's frustration and eventual willingness to submit his virgin

²³ Von Rad, *Genesis*, 212. Also, read Genesis 10:15-19, Leviticus 18:21-30 and Deuteronomy 7:1.

²⁴ Von Rad, *Genesis*, 212.

²⁵ Harry A. Hoffner Jr., "Symbols for Masculinity and Femininity: Their use in Ancient Near Eastern Sympathetic Magic Rituals," *JBL* 85 (1966): 330.

²⁶ B. A. Brooks, "Fertility Cult Functionaries in the Old Testament," *JBL* 60 (1941): 243.

²⁷ Von Rad, *Genesis*, 212.

daughters to rape over surrendering his male guests was recognition of the moral infraction of homosexual acts, he says.²⁸

Father Daniel Helminiak in *What the Bible Really Says About Homosexuality* does not dispute the sexual connotation in the story, neither does he negate the fact that the townsmen's sexual preference was for men, not women. However, he questions Lot's moral judgment to suffer social stigma, future financial cost and the future of his virgin daughters over allowing his male guests to be sexually abused.²⁹ His resentment of Lot can only validate a simple truth, that is, from Lot's moral lens homosexual rape was more egregious than heterosexual rape. It also confirms Lot's deep Hebrew religious conviction that sodomy was a form of idolatry worthy of divine judgment.³⁰ But Helminiak also shares his uncertainty about whether the text "refers to homogenital acts or not" and concludes, "What is certain is that the text is concerned about abuse, not simply sex."³¹ His statement is contradictory since he has already assessed that the sexual preference of the townsmen was not for women. He does not believe homosexuality is condemned in the text and to impose anything other than abuse upon the story "is to misuse the text," he says.³²

Bailey's cognitive knowledge theory and Helminiak's criticism of Lot's morality do not survive Richard Lovelace's review in *Homosexuality and the Church*. He explains

²⁸ Von Rad, *Genesis*, 212. See also Leviticus 18:22; 20:13, 22-27, "Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is abomination"; "If a man lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination, they shall surely be put to death; their blood shall be upon them."

²⁹ Daniel Helminiak, *What the Bible Really Says About Homosexuality* (San Francisco: Alamo Square, 1994), 37.

³⁰ 2 Peter 2:7 "He rescued righteous Lot, an upright man who had been sickened by the debauched way in which these vile people behaved."

³¹ Helminiak, *What the Bible Really Says*, 37.

³² Helminiak, *What the Bible Really Says*, 39.

the pricelessness of a woman's virginity in the Old Testament³³ and describes the emphasis placed on a woman's sexual wholesomeness as significant in the narrative since, in Israelite culture, a woman's virginity was valued and insisted upon before marriage. If the girl perjured herself by claiming to be a virgin when she was not, the girl was to be put to death. Or if she was violated by a man before marriage he was to financially recompense her father and marry her "without subsequent divorce" in honor of the "one flesh" concept.³⁴ Lovelace argues that Lot's deliberate decision to violate that covenant in order to protect the male guests and himself from judgment shows the contempt that existed for such indignity.³⁵

Bailey describes Lovelace's thought as pure fantasy.³⁶ Sodom's sexual interpretation is a Christian theological viewpoint. The alternative to that would be a non-sexual reason which is more complimentary to the overall "spirit of the narrative" and is "more satisfactory," he says.³⁷ He rationalizes that the townsmen's intent was to gain an awareness of the guest's credentials and purpose.³⁸

Martin Nissinen in *Homoeroticism in the Biblical World* rejects Bailey's credential inspection theory. Nissinen asserts that although the element of bribery is present it does not cancel out the sexual overtone in the wider theme of hospitality. He believes that the various themes that have been defended by scholars are parts of an

³³ Richard Lovelace, *Homosexuality and the Church* (Old Tappan: Fleming H Revell Company, 1978), 108.

³⁴ Lovelace, *Homosexuality and the Church*, 108.

³⁵ Lovelace, *Homosexuality and the Church*, 108.

³⁶ Bailey, *Tradition*, 5-8.

³⁷ Bailey, *Tradition*, 5.

³⁸ Bailey, *Tradition*, 4.

integral whole. One single sin did not cause the collapse of that world, but it was an ever-mounting plethora of transgressions which included homosexuality and inhospitality and a paucity of respect for human and divine dignity.³⁹ He makes an interesting observation regarding the townsmen's motivation "to know," speculating that Lot's daughters would not have been an acceptable sexual substitute since the incentive behind the attempted rape was not so much to gratify a sexual desire, but to humiliate the male guests and Lot by showing domination:

There is no need to assume Lot's guests would have been handsome young men for whom the Sodomite men felt erotic attraction. The men were motivated not to satisfy their sexual lust, but to show their supremacy and power over Lot himself, a resident alien to whom a lesson was to be taught about the place of a foreigner in the city of Sodom.⁴⁰

Nissinen references the prophet Ezekiel's account of Sodom's pride, arrogance and peak of moral degradation evidenced by the townsmen's attempt to rape angelic beings who are a-sexual.⁴¹

This author's position is that White's assessment of Sodom's abominable acts as "pride, excess food, prosperous ease and not encouraging the poor and needy" was a partial truth for he stopped shy of exploring the full scope of the "abominations."⁴² The Hebrew word for "abomination" is *To'ebah*. According to Strong's, when used with reference to God, this word describes people, things, acts, relationships and characteristics that are detestable to him because they are contrary to his nature such as

³⁹ Martti Nissinen, *Homoeroticism in the Biblical World* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1998), 46-48.

⁴⁰ Nissinen, *Homoeroticism*, 49.

⁴¹ Nissinen, *Homoeroticism*, 48. See also Ezekiel 16 for the list of Sodom's sins.

⁴² White, *What the Bible Says and Does Not Say*, 11. See Ezekiel 16 in its entirety to understand the full scope of Sodom's abominable acts.

idolatry and pagan cultic practices.⁴³ Conceivably Ezekiel's Jewish audience had knowledge of the Genesis story and would have associated *To'evah* with its sensual meaning which is more than what White has put forth.

The New Testament apostle, Jude, understood Sodom's other sins were sensual in nature and profoundly contributed to their destruction. Jude describes an indulgence in gross sexual immorality and the pursuit of "strange" flesh. The Greek word for "strange" is *heteros*, which means "another kind."⁴⁴ The circumstance that surrounded Jude's address to the Christian believers was his awareness of immoral men who had quietly crept into the assembly claiming a new revelatory interpretation or "new truth" of the scripture. Jude states that, inflamed with sexual passion, those men perverted the truth. He warns against their pride, alleges that they were out of touch with reality and that believers must earnestly struggle for the truth and rescue those who have been affected by their teaching. The apostle Peter also chronicled the event and he too identifies sensuality or sexual pleasure among other sins that sealed Sodom's fate and should serve as a warning for our time.⁴⁵

Interestingly enough White does not mention Peter or Jude's explanatory accounts in his writing. Perhaps he does not believe sex was central to the theme of Sodom's message. However, he does acknowledge attempted homosexual gang rape⁴⁶ which

⁴³ *Strong's*, s.v. "To'evah." See also Henry Wansbrough, ed., *The New Jerusalem Bible* (New York: Doubleday, 1999), Leviticus 18:22; 20:13.

⁴⁴ *Strong's*, s.v. "Het'-er-os."

⁴⁵ Spiros Zodhiates, ed., *Hebrew-Greek Key Word Study Bible* (Chattanooga, TN: AMG Publishers, 1990), 2 Peter 2: 6-8.

⁴⁶ White, *What the Bible Says and Does Not Say*, 12.

conflicts with Bailey's who does not recognize any sexual overtone at all. Both authors are homosexuals.

The Holiness Code – Leviticus 17-26

Male-on-male sexual activity in the ancient world was a symbol of idolatry (18:30) and invited divine retribution. The Holiness Code does not differentiate nor give immunity to groups that consider themselves innate homosexuals or heterosexuals who engage in homosexual acts. The Levitical writer repeatedly documents that the Canaanites and their land were defiled by their abominable lifestyle (18:14-30). God was repulsed by it and imposed punishment for they did not regard divine order (20:23). The same fate awaited the Hebrews should they proceed down that path (18:24-25, 27-28).

The Book of Leviticus in the view of traditional Judaism contains divine regulations, both ceremonial and moral, regarding worship, purity, and moral living by which the Israelite people were bound. While the ceremonial law was abolished in the New Testament covenant (Hebrews 9:22, Acts 10:14-15), the moral law is the manifestation of God's character, will and standard of holiness for his people. It is inspired and written by God himself. That, according to the apostle Peter, is at the core of our civilization transcending time and culture for it refers to our relationship with God and neighbor (see 2 Peter 1-3). Jesus and the apostles upheld the moral law regarding sexual morality such as adultery (Mark 10:19), incest (1 Corinthians 5:1), and same-sex intercourse (Romans 1:26-27, 32).

White rejects this view. He believes that the sex law prohibitions in the Holiness Code served a particular people, purpose and time which were to set Israel apart from

idolatrous nations and does not pertain to Christians and homosexuality today.⁴⁷ He challenges the severe purported definition of the Hebrew word *to'ebah* to mean anything less than evil. Helminiak and others⁴⁸ agree that religious, not moral, sensitivity was behind the prohibition of homosexual acts which was exclusive to the Israelites. They were to be true to their distinctiveness and religious tradition and not imitate the Canaanite religious practice and “Gentile identity” for which male-on-male sex was sacramental.⁴⁹ Those authors stated that, since homosexual activity today is not associated with any religious and fertility rite as prohibited in the Holiness Code, then the moral law in today’s culture is irrelevant and cannot be used to judge gay sex:

Except under unusual circumstances, sex in our culture plays no role in religious rituals. No sex today, gay or straight, has the religious associations to which Leviticus objected. So the Leviticus code is irrelevant for deciding whether gay sex is right or wrong...its reasons for forbidding it have no bearing on today’s discussion of homosexuality.⁵⁰

They⁵¹ also dispute the Hebrew interpretation of the word “abomination” which they think was solely linked to ritual uncleanness that dishonored Israelite ancient culture and not an abhorrent or morally repulsive behavior in general. The biblical text does not label male-on-male sexual intercourse as “wrong” or as “sin” because it does not specifically address individual acts within gentile worship. However, it would be a

⁴⁷ White, *What the Bible Says and Does Not Say*, 13-14.

⁴⁸ Tom Horner, *Jonathan Loved David: Homosexuality in Biblical Times* (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster, 1978), 85; John Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance and Homosexuality* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1980).

⁴⁹ Helminiak, *What the Bible Really Says*, 45-47.

⁵⁰ Helminiak, *What the Bible Really Says*, 47.

⁵¹ Helminiak and Horner. See also Boswell, *Christianity*, 100-103.

“ritual violation” and considered unclean for the Israelites to engage in such an act, because it was “Canaanite-like and un-Jewish,” says Helminiak.⁵²

Bailey argues that there is a distinctive difference between innate homosexuality and homosexual acts.⁵³ The former is inborn, natural and cannot be changed while the latter is absolute perversion. Bailey feels that both innate homosexuals and heterosexuals who engage in sexual activity that diverts from their orientation are perverts. He believes that the Levitical injunction addressed heterosexual perversion and not innate homosexuality.⁵⁴

Nissinen maintains that the prohibition of homoeroticism in the Levitical Law cannot be linked solely to cultic practices, nor does it allow for homosexual activity outside of the cultic context.⁵⁵ He speculates that the condemnation of homoeroticism may have predated the “cultic context,” since, in ancient Mesopotamia, male castration, cross-dressing and third-gender roles were culturally acceptable and signified devotion to a deity.⁵⁶ The confusion of gender roles was taboo in Israelite society (Deuteronomy 22:5) in order to protect the peace, gendered structure, population growth (which was vital for the survival of Israelite society), and inviolability of the institution called “family.” The Israelites had an awareness of those socio-sexual restrictions that were

⁵² Helminiak, *What the Bible Really Says*, 49-54.

⁵³ Bailey, *Tradition*, x-xi.

⁵⁴ Bailey, *Tradition*, x.

⁵⁵ Nissinen, *Homoeroticism*, 41.

⁵⁶ Nissinen, *Homoeroticism*, 42-43. Also see James Neill, *The Origins and Role of Same-Sex Relationships in Human Societies* (Jefferson: McFarland, 2009), 84-87.

fundamental to their existence while they struggled to form their national identity, says Nissinen.⁵⁷

Natural versus Unnatural – Romans 1:18-32

Romans 1 is arguably the most controversial biblical text that condemns same-sex intercourse beyond the epoch of the old covenant into the realm of the apostolic era. The apostle Paul guards the concept of sexual union and gender identity as prescribed in Genesis. He is vocal and echoes the Holiness Code in his time as it relates to homosexuality today. Paul claims that all human beings have an innate mental capacity to recognize God's will, but have restrained the truth concerning God's holiness in moral wrongfulness. Paul describes same-sex intercourse as ritualistic, a "degrading passion,"⁵⁸ and unnatural, and he consigns the behavior to idolatry because it swapped the natural human sexual function for something other than its intended design.⁵⁹

Fundamental to modern academic debate is the meaning of the term "natural" and whether it is conditional to one's personal choice of being or sexual orientation. The controversy among contemporary exegetes like White and Boswell is that Paul did not condemn legitimate homosexually oriented invert, for same-sex intercourse was inherently "natural" to them. They understood Paul's repulsion to be a matter of sexual ethics among heterosexuals who were engaging in homosexual acts irrespective of their heterosexual orientation. Their behavior was "excessive," out of control and in revolt against their own personal heterosexual inclination: The persons Paul condemns are manifestly not homosexuals: what he derogates are homosexual acts committed by

⁵⁷ Nissinen, *Homoeroticism*, 41-42.

⁵⁸ Strong's, s.v. "atimia."

⁵⁹ Strong's, s.v. "phusikōs."

apparently heterosexual persons...the whole point of Romans 1, in fact is to stigmatize persons who have rejected their calling, gotten off the true path they were once on.⁶⁰

Our creator celebrates our passion. But...when passion gets control of our lives, we're in deep trouble.⁶¹

Helminiak also opposed the orthodox Christian interpretation of "natural" and "unnatural" to mean anything more than "unexpected" or "in an unusual way" when used elsewhere in Paul's writings.⁶² His interpretation of the text rejects any ethical wrongdoing that defies God, nature, or conflicts with the natural created order of things. He speculates on the women's "unnatural" sex function that it probably meant they were engaging in sex "standing up, during menstruation, with an uncircumcised man, oral sex, or heterosexual anal sex," all of which would constitute "unnatural," socially unacceptable behavior and offend Jewish religious sensitivity.⁶³ He believed that Paul was on the Gentile side of the debate and recognized homogenital sex as trivial for the purity law had been superseded in Christ and does not matter. But Helminiak also chastises Paul for being hypocritical, vacillating on his position to curry favor with both his Jewish and Gentile Christian audience for his convenience in presenting the gospel to

⁶⁰ Boswell, *Christianity*, 109-112.

⁶¹ White, *What the Bible Says and Does Not Say*, 15.

⁶² Helminiak, *What the Bible Really Says*, 65. In Romans 11: 24 "natural" is translated as "unusual": "For if thou wert cut off of the wild olive tree which is natural to thee, and, contrary to nature were grafted into the good olive tree, how much more shall they that are the natural branches be grafted into their own olive tree."

⁶³ Helminiak, *What the Bible Really Says*, 65, 69-70, 73-76.

all, even if it meant denigrating one group in order to gain acceptance from the other, he says.⁶⁴

The opinion of this author is that Helminiak's deduction of the Pauline indictment to unusual heterosexual sex positions may have been a missed opportunity to address Paul's charge which was a rejection of the created sexual purpose of the human body.

Malokois and Arsenokoitai — 1 Corinthians 6:9 and 1 Timothy 1:10

Elsewhere in the New Testament Paul speaks against same-sex intercourse: 1 Corinthians 6:9 says, "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God... nor effeminate, nor abusers of mankind," and 1 Timothy 1:10 states, "The law is made...for them that defile themselves with mankind." Two Greek words are used for homosexuals in the texts and they are *malaokois*⁶⁵ which means effeminate and *arsenokoitēs*⁶⁶ which refers to same-sex intercourse. They are used with a negative connotation to refer to men and catamites (young boys) that have been "softened," "made passive" or "sodomized" by other males in same-sex relationships. Craig Williams in *Roman Sexuality* explains that boys who were beautiful looking were kept as sexual companions by men in positions of power in ancient Rome.⁶⁷ Jesus spoke mockingly on the matter in Luke 7:24-25 and Matthew 11:8 saying to the multitude, "But what did you go out to see? A man dressed in soft clothing? Behold those who wear soft clothing and live delicately are in

⁶⁴ Helminiak, *What the Bible Really Says*, 79-83. The author states that Paul exploited Jewish Christians' sense of superiority to win their compassion by agreeing, if only momentarily, that the Gentiles were impure, (not immoral), because of their indulgence in homogenital practices. He would later dispose of their judgment and mock their self-righteousness through circumcision, but who disobeyed the law in other areas (2:1).

⁶⁵ Frederick William Danker, *Lexicon of the New Testament* (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 2000). s.v. "*malaokois*."

⁶⁶ Danker, s.v. "*arsenokoitēs*."

⁶⁷ Craig Williams, *Roman Homosexuality* (London: Oxford University Press, 2010), 52-55, 75.

Kings' palaces." White believes otherwise that Jesus says nothing about same-sex behavior, and Paul does not explicitly condemn it. Rather they were critical of "heterosexual married men who hired and exploited call boys or male prostitutes for sexual pleasure."⁶⁸ The challenge to that argument by the traditionalist is that Jesus had not denounced other sexual infractions such as incest, rape and bestiality, not because they were irrelevant or he was more sexually liberated, but perhaps the behavior was so clearly condemned in the Holiness Code that there would have been no need to rehearse it.

Boswell also pushed back and stated that modern translations have evolved over time, and that the nouns *malaokois* and *arsenokoitēs* are more ambiguous and do not carry the same meaning as they did in Paul's time. Even though the terms may refer to homosexuals in classical Greco-Roman writing there is unsubstantiated evidence that it had an "inherent relationship" to gays or homosexuals since the term was used broadly to refer to "general immoral weakness," he says.⁶⁹ Boswell reasons that the terms represent both passive and active homosexual roles, which infers heterosexual male prostitution and suggests that Paul was mostly concerned about prostitution and not any homosexual act.⁷⁰ Boswell believes that Paul and Jesus may have publicly favored heterosexual relations in their debates, but the intent was to protect the disadvantaged who had been neglected in that society and says nothing about homosexual relations:

Jesus and Paul...frame their answers in terms of heterosexual relationships... Their intent was manifestly not to explain or legislate on the whole range of human affections...they simply answered some troublesome questions submitted

⁶⁸ White, *What the Bible Says and Does Not Say*, 4, 18.

⁶⁹ Boswell, *Christianity*, 340-341.

⁷⁰ Boswell, *Christianity*, 340-341.

to them by persons attempting to establish a new sexual morality in societies where there were no social services for the widowed or orphaned; no legal protection for unwed mothers or alimony for divorcees; no effective means of birth control except abstinence, abortion, or abandonment of unwanted children.⁷¹

Boswell further states that gay relationships pose no moral or legal threat to society since they “leave no one defenseless, create no unwanted pregnancies or illegitimate offspring, and [are] not likely to produce property-settlement problems.”⁷² He discounts the biblical text as being the principal reliable moral authority on Christian ethics on the basis that “early Christians were open to other reading material that would shape their ethics that is now regarded as apocryphal.”⁷³ Furthermore the literal word “homosexual” was not mentioned in the Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek and Syriac manuscripts nor was it recorded anywhere in the biblical text, he says. Boswell suggests that there was a divisive conspiracy among the “bible-based legislators” of the twentieth century to impose their own theological interpretation of morality upon one that pre-existed.⁷⁴

L. William Countryman in “The Bible, Heterosexism, and the American Public Discussion of Sexual Orientation” also blames mainstream protestant churches that have a traditional perspective for imposing upon society a conservative socio-religious viewpoint of the scriptures that affirms heterosexualism as the *status quo* and key to America’s social structure.⁷⁵ He claims that Protestantism’s strong commitment to the scripture comes without any aspirations for “new spiritual or religious illumination” and

⁷¹ Boswell, *Christianity*, 116-117.

⁷² Boswell, *Christianity*, 117.

⁷³ Boswell, *Christianity*, 92.

⁷⁴ Boswell, *Christianity*, 92.

⁷⁵ L. William Countryman, “The Bible, Heterosexism, and the American Public Discussion of Sexual Orientation” in *God Forbid*, Kathleen M. Sands, ed. (New York, NY: Oxford University, 2000), 168-181.

is motivated strictly by legalistic purposes to deny rights to homosexuals and civil liberties to other minority groups as endorsed by the scriptures:

In the matter of sexuality today...whatever the currently acknowledged representatives of Protestant Christianity say will be widely accepted as an accurate representation of the biblical witness. The Bible is conceived as quintessentially Protestant. Protestantism is the culture religion of America. What actually drives most public claims about the Bible and homosexuality, then, is not careful reading of the Bible itself, but the heterosexism that is a part of our existing cultural presuppositions.⁷⁶

Countryman believes that the universal heterosexism analysis in Sodom was reflective of Protestant protectiveness of heterosexuality by “overinterpreting” the scripture.⁷⁷ He considers the creation narrative, which implies that male and female are complementary sexes in the Adamic society, as another presupposition of the culture religion to validate heterosexuality as the monolific model for family. Homosexuality, then, is immoral, even though “it does not automatically reject other possibilities.”⁷⁸ In reference to Paul’s injunction, he asserts that a diversion from the normal does not constitute sinful, but unusual, which does not necessarily mean immoral.⁷⁹ He argued that similar diversions of the original order of creation are “celebrating the Sabbath on Sunday instead of Saturday and Jesus’ choice of living a celibate, non-procreative life are evidences that homosexuality, which departs from the pattern of creation as laid down in Genesis, is not intrinsically sinful.”⁸⁰

⁷⁶ Countryman, “Discussion,” 169-170. He refers to scriptures that endorse slavery (Ephesians 6:5-9) and the oppression of women (1 Timothy 2:12).

⁷⁷ Countryman, “Discussion,” 174.

⁷⁸ Countryman, “Discussion,” 176-177.

⁷⁹ Countryman, “Discussion,” 176-177.

⁸⁰ Countryman, “Discussion,” 179.

Homosexuality and the Modern Church

The modern Christian Church has not strayed from the fundamental teachings of the patristic era regarding homosexuality. Robert Alexander in *Ante-Nicene Fathers* cites the apostolic teachings from the third and fourth centuries: “Thou shalt not corrupt boys; for this wickedness is contrary to nature, and arose from Sodom, which was therefore entirely consumed with fire sent from God. Let such a one be accursed and all the people shall say, so be it.”⁸¹ J. B. Morris in *Homilies of Saint S. John Chrysostom*, quoted Chrysostom’s sermon against homosexual practice:

Their doctrine is satanical and their life diabolical...the man who was created to be the instructor of the woman and she who was created to become his helpmate both work the deeds of enemies against one another...both abandoned divine ordination...dishonored nature...trampled on the laws...behaved lawlessly against nature...for I should not only say that thou [the man] has become a woman, but that thou has lost thy manhood, and hast neither changed into that nature nor kept that which thou haddest, but thou hast been a traitor to both.⁸²

Roy Deferrari in *The Fathers of the Church* explains that patristic writers Clement of Alexandria and John Chrysostom, whose teachings have helped shape Christianity, did not make any reservations in their language to condemn same-sex intercourse based on the natural order previously discussed. In fact, their deconstruction of Romans 1 not only points to a breach in the order of procreation, but they make a correlation between a homosexual person and a farmer who sows seeds “in unnatural resting places” that is contrary to nature for the ground is non-conducive to fruit bearing and the life which the

⁸¹ Robert Alexander and James Donaldson, eds. *The writings of the fathers down to A.D. 325*, Vol. 7 sec. 1 in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, rev. ed. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994), 466. Fathers of the 3rd and 4th century were: Lactantius, Venantius, Asteria, Victorinus, Dionysius – Apostolic teaching and constitutions, homily and liturgies.

⁸² J.B. Morris and John H. Parker, trans. “Epistle of St. Paul The Apostle to the Romans,” *The Homilies of S. John Chrysostom*, (London, England: Oxford, 1841), 45-47.

seed contains is dishonored.⁸³ For Clement, the homosexual who simply swaps functions and the transsexual who surgically swaps anatomical organs in an attempt to “correct the natural order” may indeed experience an outward change, but the nature of who they were created to be remains unaffected.⁸⁴

Stanley Grenz in *Welcoming But Not Affirming*, underscores the prevailing tension between Christianity, the scientific community and an accepting North American society concerning homosexual practice. The two divisive questions polled today are, how does the Church respond to the gay agenda that demands inclusion into mainline denominations based on scientific research, and should the modern Church loosen its theological and ethical stance on sexuality for the purpose of inclusiveness or should it protect the biblical authority? Grenz affirms the Church’s position from an ecclesiastical constituent and claims that without compromising the biblical teachings on sexual chastity the church can help homosexuals through their spiritual journey to wholeness by not focusing so much on their change in sexual orientation, but on God’s grace, that is, how they can “live chastely in the midst of the fallenness of this present age.”⁸⁵ However, he cautions the church not to affirm sinful behavior, for inclusion of homosexuals in the church community requires repentance and denunciation of their former lifestyle “so that together we might become a holy people”:

Christ’s community welcomes all sinners, affirming them as persons of value in God’s sight, but like the Master who boldly commanded the adulterous woman

⁸³ Roy Deferrari, “Clement Of Alexandra: Christ The Educator,” in *The Fathers Of The Church*, trans. by Simon P. Wood (New York, NY: Fathers Of The Church, Inc., 1954), 164-165.

⁸⁴ Deferrari, *The Fathers Of The Church*, 165-167. It is the opinion of this author that the teachings of Clement express fidelity to the holiness code as he exhorts believers to live out their faith in godliness. At the time of this writing none of the patristic writings have been found to excuse homosexuality based on scientific or psychological disorder.

⁸⁵ Stanley Grenz, *Welcoming But Not Affirming* (Louisville, KY: Westminster Press, 1998), 135.

the leaders brought to him, “From now on do not sin again” (John 8:11), the welcoming community of Christ’s disciples steadfastly refuses to affirm any type of sinful behavior.⁸⁶

Dobson agrees with Grenz and states that the apostolic attitude toward homosexuality, inside and outside of the Church, is expressed in “equally unmistakable terms” as a perversion of the will of God for humans and must not be pursued as an alternative lifestyle.⁸⁷ Dobson believes that the church community ought to respond with love and compassion and a welcoming atmosphere for those who are trapped in homosexuality and offer care through therapeutic intervention of a Christian psychologist, who is faithful to the Word of God. He reported a 70 percent conversion rate from homosexual to heterosexual relationships when these parameters are in place.⁸⁸

Conversion through Salvation

Several Christian ministries offer conversion therapy to homosexual persons through spiritual healing. *Exodus International*, a non-profit interdenominational organization believes that homosexuality is a lifestyle of choice. It is spearheaded by former homosexuals who have experienced sexual emancipation and renewal, through the power of salvation in Jesus Christ.⁸⁹ Emphasis is placed on salvation from sin and a determination to live and commit one’s sexuality to Jesus Christ. Responsibility for transformation is placed on the homosexual to shun temptation. They preach celibacy for singles and commitment to a healthy heterosexual marriage for couples are the bases for

⁸⁶ Grenz, *Welcoming*, 157.

⁸⁷ Dobson, *Answers*, 452- 453.

⁸⁸ Dobson, *Answers*, 453.

⁸⁹ Exodus International, “Reaching The World in Grace and Truth,” <http://www.exodus international.org> (accessed March 14, 2012).

homosexual transformation and heterosexual reconciliation into the image of God as His creative design.

E. Mansell Pattison, in his article “Ex-Gays: Religiously Mediated Change in Homosexuals,” reports successful conversion rates of homosexuals from homosexuality to exclusive heterosexuality by charismatic religious organizations. Such reports challenge the ideology of the gay liberationists that homosexual orientation is permanent and change is impossible. Pattison’s study claims to have evaluated 11 former gay men who experienced complete change in sexual orientation through Christian conversion.⁹⁰ The mean age of the sample group was 27 years. All participants were highly educated professionals, healthy, and intensely loyal to the homosexual lifestyle. The beginning of their homosexual development could be traced back to their early childhood experience which involved a typically conflicted family unit. They were unhappy with their learned effeminate behavior and sought change and maturation through sexual identification with other men. Altogether the homosexual relationships became unfulfilling on a multitude of levels with the accompaniment of guilt and shame. The acceptance of salvation in Christ Jesus and the welcoming support groups within the Christian fellowship helped fulfill their desire to change to heterosexuality. The subjects commented that the ideology of the Church, based upon a biblical blueprint, exposed for them the truth concerning “psychological immaturity and poor interpersonal relationships” that prevent a person from living an ethically enriched life.⁹¹ According to Pattison and Pattison, for everyone in the membership, sexual promiscuity, premarital and extramarital sex are morally

⁹⁰ Mansell E. Pattison and Myrna Pattison, “Ex-Gays: Religiously Mediated Change in Homosexuals,” *American Journal of Psychiatry* 137, no. 12 (December 1980): 1553-1562.

⁹¹ Pattison and Pattison, “Ex-Gays,” 1558.

outside biblical boundaries regardless of sexual orientation. Celibacy is the preferred lifestyle for singles and marriage to the opposite sex is celebrated once that person comes to interpersonal maturation.⁹² The ideology of sexual ethics removes the psychological burden from the homosexual to prove his maleness: "Sexual intercourse is the consequence of love and an expected part of a marital relationship. Therefore, there is an active prohibition against engaging in sexual intercourse to prove masculinity or to overcome homosexuality."⁹³ Assimilation into the fellowship enables homosexuals to identify with Christian men and women in a non-erotic communal setting which is significant to their steady diminution in homosexuality and subsequent change in sexual orientation.⁹⁴

Since religious conversion, individuals report increased self-acceptance, mental well-being, and happiness. Depression, tension, and paranoia were reduced significantly. In these cases remission occurs without secular professional intervention. While occasional dreams and transitory memories of past homosexual relations surface in their heterosexual relationships they are not acted upon even though three of the subjects' behavior indicated neurotic symptoms of "discomfort, guilt and anxiety."⁹⁵ Pattison and Pattison conclude that the study provided sufficient evidence that homosexuality was not an immutable condition. It was a learned behavior that was changeable and redeemable through "folk therapy."⁹⁶ The process begins with an intuitive or cognitive awareness,

⁹² Pattison and Pattison, "Ex-Gays," 1556.

⁹³ Pattison and Pattison, "Ex-Gays," 1556.

⁹⁴ Pattison and Pattison, "Ex-Gays," 1556.

⁹⁵ Pattison and Pattison, "Ex-Gays," 1555.

⁹⁶ Pattison and Pattison, "Ex-Gays," 1555-1562.

followed by a behavioral response to that knowledge, and lastly an “intrapsychic resolution” to change: “When homosexuality is defined as an immutable and fixed condition that must be accepted, the potential for change seems slim. In our study when homosexuality was defined as a changeable condition, it appeared that change was possible.”⁹⁷

The Courage Apostolate, a Catholic ministry designed to minister to same-sex attractions, also offers the possibility of regeneration, but through self-discipline. The distinguishing difference is that *Courage* infers that homosexuality cannot be changed, but homosexuals overcome sexual temptation by submitting to a life of chastity, prayer, fellowship, chaste friendships, and living by example.⁹⁸ Jeffrey Satinover in *Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth*, supports change that has a balance of spiritual and secular treatment. He is cautious of ministries such as *Exodus* that advocate for “personal accountability and self-discipline” over secular treatments which can have a repercussive effect:

A particular problem arises with those ministries that lack a clear understanding of the healing process...there will always be people who seek to change but are not successful even after many years of effort...some of these relapse into a vocally gay-activist posture and become hostile toward the ministries they perceive as having failed, or even deluded them.⁹⁹

He states that ministries that sermonize chastity and obedience to the will of God without secular adjunct healing compromise the health of homosexuals. Should the ministry be unable to help these persons ascertain heterosexual reinstatement “many will fall into

⁹⁷ Pattison and Pattison, “Ex-Gays,” 1562.

⁹⁸ *The Courage Apostolate*, www.couragec.net (accessed March 14, 2012).

⁹⁹ Jeffrey Satinover, *Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1996), 196-209.

hopelessness and despair or into rebellion.”¹⁰⁰ White, in *Stranger at the Gate*, characterizes himself as the homosexual who has lost hope in mainstream healing ministries.¹⁰¹ White discusses growing up in a stable, loving, nuclear family, but wrestling with homosexual desires throughout his life. Restoration to sexual wholeness was not achieved through his evangelical church despite submitting to 25 years of therapy, chaste friendships, fasting and prayer. Desperate for change, and disappointed that he was not healed of his homosexual orientation, White left his traditional church roots in rebellion and stated:

It’s the same primitive, misleading line used by many in the “ex-gay” movement today...“If you have enough faith,” they promise, “God can do anything.”...I believed it. Now I know how dangerous and misleading the whole process can be. I fasted and prayed for healing...but over the long haul, my sexual orientation didn’t change...my need for a loving...gay man...increased with every prayer...My psychiatrist implied that I wasn’t really cooperating with the Spirit of God.¹⁰²

White became a prominent activist for gay and lesbian Christians and campaigned for full inclusion in the mainline denominations.¹⁰³ After 40 years he resolved that his homosexual orientation was a “gift from God,”¹⁰⁴ and he eventually turned on the organization that tried to facilitate his healing: “Holding out these ‘ex-gay’ hopes that our sexual orientation can be changed is just another way of telling lies. [Advocates of] these

¹⁰⁰ Satinover, *Politics*, 201.

¹⁰¹ Mel White, *Stranger at the Gate* (New York, NY: Simon & Schuster, 1994). Mel is dean of Cathedral of Hope in Dallas, Texas, a 10,000 membership of gay and lesbian Christians.

¹⁰² White, *Stranger*, 28-31.

¹⁰³ White, *Stranger*, 28-31.

¹⁰⁴ White, *Stranger*, 267, 272.

ex-gay solutions to desperate gays and lesbians will be held accountable to God for the terrible consequences of those lies.”¹⁰⁵

White refutes the so-called antiquated literal translation of scripture that condemns homosexuality. He states that with the introduction of scientific knowledge that followed Moses’ time the scriptures do not apply today.¹⁰⁶ Those scriptural passages speak of a unique situation of “ceremonial uncleanness” and sexual irresponsibility.¹⁰⁷ According to White, to import the use of those passages for today would be “misusing the Bible to support old prejudice.”¹⁰⁸ The biblical authors who spoke discriminately of homosexual acts do not mention “sexual orientation,” which White believes to be genetically predetermined: “Those six biblical passages used to attack and condemn us...the authors never once speak of “sexual orientation.” The fact that some people are shaped at birth, or conditioned in earliest childhood to a lifetime of same-sex intimacy is a scientific discovery less than a century old.”¹⁰⁹

What Does the Bible Say about Human Sexuality?

Christian proponents of homosexuality feel that mainstream traditional churches are not channeling their energies economically by debating same-sex relationships. White advocates that the Bible is a narrative of God’s love for humanity and not an instruction manual on human sexuality. He believes that through scientific research the Holy Spirit

¹⁰⁵ White, *Stranger*, 273.

¹⁰⁶ White, *Stranger*, 237.

¹⁰⁷ White, *Stranger*, 238.

¹⁰⁸ White, *Stranger*, 238.

¹⁰⁹ White, *Stranger*, 238. The six biblical passages are: Genesis 19:1-14, Leviticus 18:22, Judges 19, Romans 1:18- 32, 1 Corinthians 6:9 and 1 Timothy 1:10.

has revealed to humankind that God's law is irrelevant and inappropriate to apply to our society because it was written for a specific time and culture in our history:

The Holy Spirit uses science to teach us why ancient words no longer apply to our modern times. During the last three decades U.S. health professionals have stated definitively that homosexual orientation is as natural as heterosexual orientation, sexual orientation is determined by a combination of unknown pre and post natal influences, and that it is dangerous and inappropriate to tell a homosexual that he or she could or should attempt to change his or her sexual orientation.¹¹⁰

The traditional church on the other hand believes that the Bible is about God's love and his relationship with his people. The stories range from conflict and conquest, worship, human sexuality and sexual immorality. They are presented to us in various literary forms such as dialogue, prophecy, songs and proverbs and serve as an instructional guide on how Christians ought to live a fulfilled life in Christ. For example, the Book of Proverbs counsels people against adultery and sexual temptation. The book counsels people to experience love in a monogamous heterosexual relationship with one's spouse.¹¹¹

Gershen Kaufman in *Coming Out of Shame* states that a homosexual's reinterpretation of self-shaming scriptures into self-affirming scriptures is referred to as the "coming out of shame process" to publicly own their sexuality.¹¹²

In summary, the ethical issue of homosexuality begins with the scripture. The traditional church believes that homosexual behavior is a matter of choice. It advocates that believers must abide by the ecclesiastical mandate and steer away from any homosexual behavior because it is not normal. According to conservative theologians, in order for the Church to remain relevant, leaders today must vie for the preservation of

¹¹⁰ White, *Homosexuality*, 8-9.

¹¹¹ Wansbrough. *Jerusalem Bible*, Proverbs 5:18-19; 6:23-24.

¹¹² Gershen Kaufman, *Coming Out of Shame* (New York, NY: Doubleday, 1996), 104-105.

sexual ethics as leaders in the patristic era did; that sex within the covenant of a monogamous marriage between one male and one corresponding female, and abstinence for the unmarried is what God requires. Revisionists believe however that the traditional interpretation of scripture as it pertains to homosexuality is old-fashioned and a new theology that is inclusive is what the modern church needs. The traditionalists conclude, however, that the inclusion of homosexuals into the covenant body of Christ without repentance strips the Church of her mission focus to invite the world to identify with a covenant God, reflecting His holy image. The prospect of homosexual conversion through religious intervention and the success rate challenges the immutability of homosexuality as professed by pro-homosexual advocates.

CHAPTER THREE

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

At the heart of the homosexual agenda is the enculturation of homosexuality into society as a sexual design. The controversies surrounding the public debate are whether homosexual causation should be considered a mental illness, if it is due to parental neglect or a genetic or hormonal predisposition, or if it is a chosen lifestyle symptomatic of sin and human deprivation. The arguments are best categorized by the following factors: pathological, psychological, scientific, and theological.

In 1993 the American Psychiatric Association (APA) board of trustees debated whether homosexuality should continue to be classified in the APA as a mental disorder.¹ The outcome of the debate effected change in the APA. Whereas homosexuality was once listed in psychiatry as a disease it has now been removed to be recognized as an accepted normal deviation, hence paving the way for the same civil and legal recognition as heterosexuality, including the right to marry.² Psychologists in opposition to this view feel homosexuality is a sign of arrested development, and a disturbed nuclear family with a culpable absentee father.³ Some scientific scholars favor a genetic and biological

¹ Robert Stoller, et al., "A Symposium: Should Homosexuality Be in the APA Nomenclature?" *American Journal of Psychiatry* 130, no. 11 (November 1973): 1207-1216.

² American Psychiatric Association (APA), "Position Statement on Homosexuality and Civil Rights," *American Journal of Psychiatry* 131:4, (April 1974), 497.

³ Irving Bieber, *Homosexuality: A Psychoanalytical Study* (New York: Basic Books, 1962), 213; Charles Socarides, *The Preoedipal Psychoanalytic Therapy of Sexual Perversions* (Madison, WI: International Universities Press, 1988), 42; Joseph Nicolosi and Linda Nicolosi, *A Parent's Guide to Preventing Homosexuality* (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2002), 22; Peter Wyden and Barbara Wyden, *Growing Up Straight: What Every Thoughtful Parent Should Know About Homosexuality* (New York, NY: Stein Day Publishers, 1968), 76-90; Dennis Altman, *Homosexual Oppression and Liberation* (New York, NY: Outerbridge and Dienstfrey, 1971), 4.

causation for homosexuality for which there is no viable cure.⁴ Others hold contrasting views based on replicated research.⁵ Theologians also have conflicting views: they either support a pro-homosexual agenda or the patristic tradition.

All may be subject to prejudice and theories are hypothetical. The debates seem devoid of a middle ground.

The Pathological Factor

Neuropsychiatrist Richard von Krafft-Ebing, in *Psychopathia Sexualis*, studied more than 200 homosexual mental cases, and determined that homosexual feeling was abnormal, a sign of a degenerative disease.⁶ The disease manifests in two forms: “acquired or hereditary congenital.”⁷ The former is believed to be caused by a neuropathic predisposition, that is, an injured nervous system influenced primarily by masturbation in early childhood, and the latter an inborn abnormality. In the case of the acquired manifestation of inversion, excessive and habitual manipulation of the sexual organ in infancy can be blamed for the disruption of the normal development of human sexual instinct:

Nothing is so prone to contaminate...the source of all noble and ideal sentiments, which arise of themselves from a normal developing sexual instinct, as the practice of masturbation in early years. It despoils the unfolding of beauty and leaves behind the coarse, animal desire for sexual satisfaction. This defect influences the morals, character, fancy, feeling and instinct of the youthful...male

⁴ Dean Hamer, et al., “A Linkage Between DNA Markers on the X Chromosome and Male Sexual Orientation,” *Science* 261, no. 5119 (July 16, 1993): 321-327; Simon Levay, “A Difference in Hypothalamic Structure Between Heterosexual and Homosexual Men,” *Science*, New Series 253, no. 5023 (August 30, 1991): 1034-37.

⁵ William Byne, “The Biological Evidence Challenged,” *Scientific American* (May 1994): 50-55; John Bancroft, “Homosexual Orientation,” *British Journal of Psychiatry* 164 (1994): 437-440.

⁶ Richard von Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis* (New York, NY: Stein and Day, 1965), 32. See also 187-189, and 221-223.

⁷ Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis*, 187.

or female, in an unfavorable manner, even causing,...the desire for the opposite sex to sink to nil; so that masturbation is preferred to the natural mode of satisfaction.⁸

According to Krafft-Ebing, persons who suffer from this defect, referred to as psychical impotence, experience moral and mental breakdown due to fear of coitus with the opposite sex or the result of it [in the case of females, pregnancy]. Fear results from insecurity in the physical ability to provide natural complete sexual satisfaction: “For every masturbator is timid and cowardly. If the youthful sinner at last comes to coitus, he is either disappointed because enjoyment is wanting, on account of defective sensual feeling, or he is lacking in the physical strength necessary to accomplish the act.”⁹ Despite psychical impotence sexual libido is still present and the need for satisfaction is fulfilled through other avenues of perverse activities, for instance, bestiality and homosexuality, he says.¹⁰

In the case of the congenital causation a hereditary neuropathic degeneration is favored by Krafft-Ebing. A study of his patients’ ancestral and blood relatives reveals “physical and mental neurosis,” “psychoses” and “degenerative signs,” all of which he perceives as indications of inversion and would substantiate his claim that homosexuality is a neurotic disease.¹¹ He suggests that with the congenital inversion homosexual feelings happen instinctively without any external stimulation or environmental interference, and may even bear upon a heterosexual orientation later in life as an

⁸ Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis*, 189.

⁹ Kraft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis*, 189.

¹⁰ Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis*, 189.

¹¹ Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis*, 223-224.

“acquired anomaly.”¹² The author is irresolute to identify any circumstance on which that acquired anomaly would depend citing an “enigmatic phenomenon,” but he hints latent homosexuality or bisexuality (clinically referred to as psycho-sexual hermaphroditism¹³) coexist in the neuropathic predisposition and “accidental exciting” would awaken it from its latent state.¹⁴

The concept of psycho-sexual hermaphroditism emanated from a preexisting study that documented the presence of bisexual behavior in animals, hence the theory that humans evolved from a bisexual predisposition.¹⁵ Taken by this idea, Krafft-Ebing supposes that at some stage in evolution the human body had become unified after the psycho-physical female and male elements struggled for superiority. The supreme sexuality emerged leaving latent remnants of the atrophied organ (or conquered sexuality) that may have aggravated “manifestations of inverted sexuality.”¹⁶

From a psychological outlook, Krafft-Ebing reasons that since the sexual glands and apparatus are of a bisexual predisposition, the same organic predisposition must hold true for the cerebral region that developed corresponding to the sexual gland: “Since the peripheral part of the sexual apparatus is of bisexual disposition, this must be true of the central part as well. Thus one must assume that the cerebrum contains male and female centers whose antagonistic action and relative strength determine the individual’s

¹² Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis*, 222.

¹³ Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis*, 221.

¹⁴ Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis*, 188.

¹⁵ Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis*, 226-227.

¹⁶ Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis*, 227.

sex behavior.”¹⁷ Flaws in this theory became evident when subsequent case studies of patients who had experienced featural hormonal changes from feminine to masculine identity had no traces of inversion.¹⁸ The observation cast doubt on the bisexual (hermaphroditic) theory and its relation to homosexuality. Krafft-Ebing realized that the brain, or “cerebral centre,” and “the peripheral sexual organs (including glands)” develop independently and are prone to developmental disturbances or defect:

That the cerebral centre is developed...independent from the peripheral sexual organs...hermaphroditism and sexual inversion stand in no relation to each other...hermaphrodites follow the law of evolution...and does not offer inverted sexuality...in sexual inversion we must look for the cause in central (cerebral) defects.¹⁹

Although the author is unsure of the factor that may cause the disturbance or brain defect he consistently points to a congenital degenerative character.²⁰ Should bisexuality or homosexuality happen due to “psychical hermaphroditism” the condition is not a permanent element of a sexual life. Change is possible: “The sexual instinct toward the opposite sex may be strengthened by the exercise of will and self-control; by moral treatment, and possibly hypnotic suggestion...but especially by abstinence from masturbation.”²¹

Another earlier pioneer of sex reform, Havelock Ellis, in chapter five of his *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, disagrees with Krafft-Ebing’s masturbation theory for the acquired cause of homosexuality. His clinical studies and observations of male and

¹⁷ Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis*, 229.

¹⁸ Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis*, 228. See also cases 129 and 130 (pages 200- 216).

¹⁹ Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis*, 229.

²⁰ Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis*, 229.

²¹ Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis*, 232.

female individuals showed no evidence of masturbation even being practiced until after a homosexual instinct had been identified, usually around puberty and thereafter.²²

Masturbation had begun at various intervals in his subjects' sexual life; some cases at the age of 20, and others at 40. Masturbation can contribute to homosexuality or may "aid the manifestation of inversion" where a predisposition to homosexual preference existed or pleasure was repressed, but there is insufficient evidence that would give validation to its prevalence in normal persons, says the author: "Masturbation, especially at an early age, may sometimes enfeeble the sexual activities, and aid the manifestations of inversion...but beyond this there is little in the history...to indicate masturbation as a cause of inversion."²³

Ellis embraces the concept of a bisexual predisposition for the cause of inversion, but objects to Krafft-Ebing's neurotic degenerative theme and use of the words "degenerate (immoral)," "disease" and "anomaly" to describe inversion as well as "undesirable" and "unfitting," because inversion is a natural congenital instinct.²⁴ The behavior is not morbid or a disease but normal, just as "color-blindedness" or "color-hearing" in an individual. The invert is insensible to what is normal and lacks the same cognitive ability to see and connect certain moral values in the formation of relationships, says Ellis.²⁵

Where Krafft-Ebing could not give a definitive explanation for the appearance of homosexuality in later years, other than latent homosexuality or psychical

²² Havelock Ellis, "The Nature of Sexual Inversion," *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, vol. II (New York: Random House, 1936), 276-278.

²³ Ellis, *Studies*, 276-278.

²⁴ Ellis, *Studies*, 320-324.

²⁵ Ellis, *Studies*, 317-318.

hermaphroditism, Ellis provided a decisive rationalization. Consistent with his case studies he states that several unique scenarios can be at work:

- “A dissatisfied and emotional shocking heterosexual love relationship acting on a predisposed organism, and developing a fairly permanent tendency to inversion.”²⁶ The “predisposed organism” would be, for example, an effeminate child that would make him a candidate “predestined to develop in a homosexual direction.”²⁷

- Single-sex schools or classrooms can arouse latent homosexuality since the focus is to direct students away from the opposite sex to concentrate on their own.²⁸

- Seduction or sexual harrassment by an adult.²⁹

Even though the last unique scenario received scholastic recognition Ellis believes it is not without conditions. Seduction or uninvited sexual solicitation on a normal sexual instinct causes inversion only where there is already an “organic predisposition to act on.”³⁰ But where a predisposition to homosexuality does not exist, “its influence will probably be temporary, disappearing in the presence of the normal stimulus,” says Ellis.³¹

The Psychological Factor

Sigmund Freud in *Three Contributions to the Theory of Sex* also joins with Ellis and objects to Krafft-Ebing’s degeneracy hypothesis on the premise that inverts cannot be viewed universally as degenerate where deviation from the normal is not apparent and the

²⁶ Ellis, *Studies*, 269. Also see pages 323-324.

²⁷ Ellis, *Studies*, 273.

²⁸ Ellis, *Studies*, 324.

²⁹ Ellis, *Studies*, 323-324.

³⁰ Ellis, *Studies*, 324.

³¹ Ellis, *Studies*, 270-271.

intellectual capacity to function in society is intact: “It would seem more appropriate not to speak of degeneration where there are not many marked deviations from the normal [and] where the capacity for working and living do not in general appear markedly impaired.”³² Freud finds offensive the designation of the term “degenerative” as a blanket for all perverse behavior not linked to “traumatic or infectious origin” because inverts do not identify as disturbed individuals, but are highly intellectual, occupy positions of prominence and whereby they have historically made contributions to their culture.³³ In fact, inversion in ancient Europe was of itself a powerful institution, says Freud: “It must be considered that inversion was a frequent manifestation among ancient nations at the height of their culture. It was an institution endowed with important functions.”³⁴ To further defeat the degeneracy idea which is customarily associated with peoples of a “higher civilisation,” Freud points out that homosexuality was also normal among peoples of “primitive races.”³⁵ In addition, Freud finds Krafft-Ebing’s case studies discriminant since they consist of only mentally ill homosexual patients and do not represent the general populace. He believes that if Krafft-Ebing had suspended his own recruit preference and subjected his practice to a wider sample size of inverts with different circumstances the guaranteed outcome would have replaced pathology with anthropology.³⁶

³² Sigmund Freud, *Three Contributions to the Theory of Sex* (New York, NY: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1962), 4.

³³ Freud, *Contributions*, 4.

³⁴ Freud, *Contributions*, 5.

³⁵ Freud, *Contributions*, 5.

³⁶ Freud, *Contributions*, 5.

Nonetheless, building on Krafft-Ebing's bisexual idea (based on a biological discovery in animals that male and female genital systems develop from a common embryonic origin), Freud conceived that the psycho-sexual impulse, or "the central manifestation of sex," that triggers inversion has a psychological root cause: namely, arrested sexual development, rather than a neurological congenital causation. The presumption made is that human innate bisexuality converts to heterosexuality and homosexuality upon parental and environmental influence.³⁷ In a letter to a distraught parent seeking his intervention, Freud writes:

Homosexuality is...nothing to be ashamed of, it cannot be classified as an illness; we consider it to be a variation of the sexual function produced by a certain arrest of sexual development. What analysis can do for your son runs on a different line. If he is unhappy, neurotic, torn by conflicts, inhibited in his social life, analysis may bring him harmony, peace of mind, full efficiency whether he remains a homosexual or gets changed.³⁸

According to Freud, homosexual behavior can be altered but only through psychoanalysis, which, in the opinion of this author, casts doubt on the validity of the earlier congenital theory that states inversion is innate: "There is only one way to obtain a thorough unerring solution of problems in the sexual life of so-called psychoneurotics... and that is by subjecting them to psychoanalytic investigation."³⁹

Contrary to Krafft-Ebing's conviction which suggests that sexual drive begins at puberty,⁴⁰ Freud concludes that development of the sexual impulse begins at the

³⁷ Freud, *Contributions*, 79-86.

³⁸ Sigmund Freud, *Letters of Sigmund Freud 1873-1938* (London, England: Hogarth Press, 1961), 419-420.

³⁹ Freud, *Contributions*, 26.

⁴⁰ Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis*, 186. "The sexual instinct and desire...remain latent until the period of development of the sexual organs."

commencement of life and starts to manifest at around age three or four.⁴¹ He and Jeffrey Satinover⁴² believe that, during his or her development, the child's exposure to perverse psychic traumatic experiences can influence their sexual aberration. For Satinover, those traumatic encounters may include and are not limited to sexual seduction and parental rejection.⁴³ The experiences are repressed in their unconscious psyche and awaken in puberty with a compulsion for repetition and can determine that person's psychic development:

Under the influence of seduction the child may become polymorphous-perverse and may be misled into all sorts of transgressions...the formation of such perversions meets but slight resistance because the psychic dams against sexual transgressions, such as shame, loathing and morality...are not yet erected or are in the process of formation.⁴⁴

Perversion influenced by seduction often progresses into adulthood with the person having a "tormenting" interest in the genitals of the other or same sex,⁴⁵ says the author. Freud also linked excessive maternal parenting to the causation of sexual inversion for he believes a mother's disproportionate love can unintentionally awaken the child's sexual impulse prematurely. For the mother's affection such as kissing and cuddling emanates from her own sexual experience and the child can unintentionally be taken as a sexual substitute: "Too much parental tenderness becomes harmful because it accelerates the sexual maturity...and makes the child weak to temporarily renounce love or be satisfied

⁴¹ Freud, *Contributions*, 38-39, 43.

⁴² Jeffrey Satinover, *Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth* (Grand Rapids, MI: Hamewith Books, 1996), 105-108. The author explains the impact of childhood trauma and its influence on a child's sexual aberration.

⁴³ Satinover, *Politics*, 105-108.

⁴⁴ Freud, *Contributions*, 51.

⁴⁵ Freud, *Contributions*, 52.

with a smaller amount of love in later life.”⁴⁶ The absence of one parent from the family equation, particularly the father, can also predispose a child to “permanent homosexuality,” as one parent “absorbs all the love of the child, and in this way establishes the determinations for the sex of the person the child will select later as the sexual object,” says Freud.⁴⁷

Frank Caprio in *Female Homosexuality* discussed other measures of psychic trauma that may predispose a young girl to lesbianism later in life: 1) exposure to parental sexual activity, and 2) nudity by the father that often develops into an Electra Complex, that is, an unwitting sexual fixation to her father which is the main composition of latent homosexuality.⁴⁸ Because of the “heterosexual block” which prevents incestuous relations with the father the girl would experience a psychological collapse as sexual desire for the father is repressed. According to Caprio the daughter will become disinterested in the opposite sex and either turn to self-masturbation as an alternative or lesbianism as a substitute for heterosexuality: “The psychic trauma of seeing her father many times in the nude acted as a foundation for the Electra Complex [which] constitutes one of the psychological causes of ...overt lesbianism...the unconscious guilt of wanting something prohibitive with her father was enough to precipitate a mental breakdown.”⁴⁹

Caprio further states that cultural and sociological shifts in society brought on by the feminist movement are added causation of sexual inversion in women.⁵⁰ Female

⁴⁶ Freud, *Contributions*, 80-84.

⁴⁷ Freud, *Contributions*, 86.

⁴⁸ Frank Caprio, *Female Homosexuality* (New York, NY: Citadel, 1954), 130.

⁴⁹ Caprio, *Female Homosexuality*, 130.

⁵⁰ Caprio, *Female Homosexuality*, 132.

emancipation from male dependency, marriage for economic security, sexual restrictions and the introduction of female “masculine tailored clothing,” tobacco addiction, etc., are marks of female defeminization and “a form of psychic masculinity.”⁵¹

Ellis and other scholars⁵² disagree with these views finding it unusual that these mechanisms are causations for homosexuality. Although they may provide psychological clarity of the processes that may lead to homosexuality, their views fall short when addressing the fundamental organic factors, says Ellis: “On a general survey...we may accept the reality of unconscious dynamic processes...the study of such mechanisms may illuminate the psychology of homosexuality, [but] they leave untouched the fundamental organic factors.”⁵³

Dr. Robert Stoller in the *American Journal of Psychiatry* diminished Freud’s “conflict” conjecture on trauma. He explains that infantile trauma cannot be responsible for homosexuality or change in a normal sexuality since psychoneurosis of the sexual development is not a product of trauma, but conflict irresolution: “Not all traumas produce conflict; conflict implies intrapsychic struggle in order to choose among possibilities.”⁵⁴ Stoller pointedly states that internal and external trauma (pain and paternal abandonment) that Freud says create “conflict” and impinge on sexual development may indeed cause a stimulus reaction and adaptation to a new conditioning, but it cannot cause “conflict.” That is an important distinction. For the author explained

⁵¹ Caprio, *Female Homosexuality*, 132-133.

⁵² Magnus Hirschfeld, *Die Homosexualität* (Berlin, Germany: L. Marcus, 1920), 344. Hirschfeld counts Freud’s view as atypical and would still be subordinate to the organic predisposition.

⁵³ Ellis, *Studies*, 308-309.

⁵⁴ Robert Stoller, “Overview: The Impact of New Advances in Sex Research on Psychoanalytic Theory,” *American Journal of Psychiatry* 130, no 3, (March 1973): 246.

that “conflict” is that internal crossroad in the developmental process that requires “the awareness of the need to choose.”⁵⁵ Therefore, it demands an advanced mental capacity to negotiate between the needs of the ego and super ego for alternative solutions, says Stoller.⁵⁶ The conflict theory is rejected by “modern scholars” because it imposes a moral superiority [and a patristic Christian theology] to the argument that deconstructs Freud’s “trauma” defense that shields homosexuals from “guilt,” “shame,” and responsibility and frees them to explore their sexual inhibitions:

New research seems aimed unanimously at tearing down the conflict theory. No other aspect of Freud’s system has created such resistance; perhaps because Freud believed perversion is motivated...a person is part responsible for his perversion. The deviant act, that Freud felt, is the product of the great human capacity for choice and so ultimately has a moral quality (even if one’s responsibility is mitigated because the choice is unconscious and was arrived at because of unsought threatening circumstances in childhood).⁵⁷

Ruth Barnhouse in *Homosexuality: A Symbolic Confusion* supports Stoller’s conflict theory. She indicated that it was the element of choice in sexual perversion that antagonized modern scholars. Barnhouse alleges that Freud and Caprio’s traumatic theory promotes a false ideology that absolves individuals of any personal responsibility for their sexual impulses since, according to Freud, they are relegated by “unconscious complexes” resulting from childhood traumatic experiences beyond their control.⁵⁸ Barnhouse theorizes that if homosexual behavior was beyond the control of individuals then the work of psychotherapists is futile, since their job is to convince patients that they are responsible for their choices and “not victims of something beyond themselves, but

⁵⁵ Stoller, “Overview: The Impact of New Advances in Sex Research,” 246.

⁵⁶ Stoller, “Overview: The Impact of New Advances in Sex Research,” 246.

⁵⁷ Stoller, “Overview: The Impact of New Advances in Sex Research,” 247. See also 248-249.

⁵⁸ Ruth Barnhouse, *Homosexuality: A Symbolic Confusion* (New York, NY: Seabury, 1977), 116-117.

that choices they made in the past, however unconsciously, can be reviewed and new decisions taken.”⁵⁹

Not all psychoanalysts followed Krafft-Ebing and Freud’s constitutional bisexual theory. Sandor Rado in his essay “A Critical Examination of the Concept of Bisexuality” points out deception in their axiom of bisexuality and its correlation with homosexuality.⁶⁰ The scientific discovery of cellular material of both species’ reproductive organs to have come from a “common embryonic origin,” invites inopportune speculations:

This unfortunate appellation of an undeveloped embryonic structure...opened the door to indiscriminate speculations on man’s sexuality. These speculations, resting on generalizations drawn from biological findings in lower animals, seemed to offer at last what appeared to be a scientific basis for the explanation of homosexuality.⁶¹

Krafft-Ebing’s neuropsychological rationalization of bisexuality which suggests a battle between the male and female centers in the brain for sexual domination states that “homosexuality results from the victory of the wrong center.”⁶² Rado believes deception resulted when Krafft-Ebing could not make an association between developmental abnormalities of the genitals (hermaphroditism) and homosexuality in his case studies, thus he proposes brain damage.⁶³ Rado describes the concept as incredulous since from 1896 up to the point of his lecture (1940) neurological exploration was unattainable: “Not

⁵⁹ Barnhouse, *Homosexuality*, 139.

⁶⁰ Sandor Rado, “A Critical Examination of the Concept of Bisexuality,” *Psychoanalysis of Behavior Collected Papers*, vol. I (New York, NY: Grune & Stratton, 1922-1956), 140.

⁶¹ Rado, “Examination,” 140.

⁶² Rado, “Examination,” 140.

⁶³ Rado, “Examination,” 140-141.

a trace of neurological evidence was then or is now available to give credence to V. Krafft-Ebing's chain of hypotheses."⁶⁴

With shared hopelessness of this hypothesis Rado believes that Freud shifted from Krafft-Ebing's neurological examination to a psychoanalytic theory of the brain coupled with some basic biological assumptions.⁶⁵ The assumptions are: the human genital system is of a twofold embryological origin; the zygote and the embryo possess bipotentiality of differentiation.⁶⁶ The hypothesis, based on an archaic and ambiguous study of embryos and their development, infers bisexuality as a characteristic of humans from which the "homosexual component" or "constitutional component" (feminine and masculine expression of the opposite sex) manifests.⁶⁷ Rado disagrees with the bisexuality theory and the biological dimension of the concept stating, "There is no such thing as bisexuality either in man or in any other of the higher vertebrates. In the final shaping of the normal individual, the double embryological origin of the genital system does not result in any physiological duality of reproductive functioning."⁶⁸ Rado remains critical of psychoanalysts who held onto Freud's position as a "ruling" rather than a hypothetical speculation especially when Freud injects the disclaimer that constitutional components of bisexuality are beyond the scope of psychoanalytic investigation: "Some forms of homosexual behavior are in no way related to the behavior pattern of the opposite sex...the assumption of a homosexual component in the constitution has not served as a

⁶⁴ Rado, "Examination," 141.

⁶⁵ Rado, "Examination," 142-146.

⁶⁶ Rado, "Examination," 142-144.

⁶⁷ Rado, "Examination," 145-147.

⁶⁸ Rado, "Examination," 145.

challenge to discover what such a component might actually consist of, and in what ways, if at all, it influences man's sexual behavior."⁶⁹

In another essay, "Adaptational View of Sexual Behavior," Rado states that heterosexuality is innate and homosexuality results from a sexual phobic reaction toward members of the opposite sex: "Individuals, deterred by fears and resentment from the opposite sex may find orgiastic satisfaction with a mate of the same-sex, thus forming a homogenous pair."⁷⁰ The idea that heterosexuals can have an innate desire for the same sex seems unsound to Rado because it does not justify why male inverts search for other males who impersonate a female if they are attracted to masculinity. Or why a male would assume a female persona to attract another male "if all he wants to do is express a male desire for another male."⁷¹ The reverse holds true as well for females who imitate macho behavior to attract other females, says Rado.⁷²

The simulation of female-male sexual characteristics and the desire to perform in that sexual pattern would support the idea that heterosexuality is the intended design: "the male-female sexual pattern is not only anatomically outlined but, through the marital order, is also culturally ingrained and perpetuated in every individual since early childhood,"⁷³ states Rado. Phobia toward the opposite sex may have suppressed or psychologically "driven underground" this intended design, where the illusion of a dual/homogenous gender is created. The decision for homogenous pairing is rationalized

⁶⁹ Rado, "A Critical Examination of the Concept of Bisexuality," 147-148.

⁷⁰ Sandor Rado, "An Adaptational View of Sexual Behavior," *Psychoanalysis of Behavior Collected Papers*, vol. I (New York, NY: Grune & Stratton, 1922-1956), 205.

⁷¹ Rado, "Sexual Behavior," 205.

⁷² Rado, "Sexual Behavior," 205.

⁷³ Rado, "Sexual Behavior," 206.

and calculated by the invert out of fear to give reason for “his [or her] actual avoidance of the opposite sex.”⁷⁴ Rado is convinced that, had it not been for his preconceived bisexual tenet, Freud would have been able to track the sexual pattern of homogeneous pairing to “an original heterosexual desire”: “By adopting instead the bisexual interpretation that the formation of homogeneous pairs was prompted by a genuinely ‘homosexual desire,’ he lost the fruits of a great discovery.”⁷⁵

Rado castigates Freudian evolution theory stating that it is antiquated and without scientific merit: “The view that each individual is both male and female (either more male and less female or the other way around) derives from a 3,000 year old mystical speculation and has no scientific foundation.”⁷⁶

Barnhouse also attempts to clear up the organic bisexual myth introduced by Freud. She explains that it is not biologically possible for the gonadal tissue of the sexes, present in every individual, to function as a sexual apparatus, nor does it contribute or connect with human sexual needs: “The mere presence of both kinds [of gonadal tissue] is totally unrelated to any biological potential to develop into a functioning member of the opposite sex, nor does it have any causal connection with the actual sexual appetites and behavior of adults.”⁷⁷ Although it was reported that the “gonadal tissue” produces higher levels of testosterone in homosexual males than in heterosexuals, “there is no proof” that increase in hormone level caused by the tissue is a basis for inversion, says

⁷⁴ Rado, “Sexual Behavior,” 206.

⁷⁵ Rado, “Sexual Behavior,” 206.

⁷⁶ Sandor Rado, “Sexual Anesthesia in the Female,” *Psychoanalysis of Behavior Collected Papers*, vol. II (New York, NY: Grune & Stratton, 1956-1961), 96.

⁷⁷ Barnhouse, *Homosexuality*, 39.

Barnhouse.⁷⁸ Conversely, there exists the daunting possibility that homosexual activity could alter the hormonal level:

It is well known that in some situations sexual activity itself affects hormone production. For example, post-menopausal women who remain sexually active continue to produce the hormones required for the maintenance of elasticity and moisture of vaginal tissue. Those who are inactive may suffer from dryness and atrophy because they stop producing the necessary hormones. In an analogous way, it is more than possible that homosexual activity itself causes the changed hormone levels which occasionally have been reported.⁷⁹

Proponents of homosexuality Cellan Ford and Frank Beach, in *Patterns of Sexual Behavior*, suggest that increased amounts of androgen administered to exclusive homosexual male patients did not alter the change in their object direction, but only intensified their sexual drive which leads to more homosexual contacts: "The fundamental error...is the unjustified assumption that gonadal hormones determine the character of the sexual drive in human beings. This is not the case. The reproductive hormones may intensify the drive but they do not organize the behavior through which it finds expression."⁸⁰ Other non-hormonal physiological and chemical factors (thyroid, pituitary glands, nervous system, drugs, inanition, etc.) contribute to human sexual behavior as well as gonadal hormones.⁸¹ Human sexual behavior is conditioned by the cultural climate, therefore it is changeable by "learning and experience,"⁸² a theory

⁷⁸ Barnhouse, *Homosexuality*, 40.

⁷⁹ Barnhouse, *Homosexuality*, 40.

⁸⁰ Cellan Ford and Frank Beach, *Patterns of Sexual Behavior* (New York, NY: Harper & Brothers, 1951), 236.

⁸¹ Ford and Beach, *Patterns*, 237.

⁸² Ford and Beach, *Patterns*, 237.

shared by Caprio.⁸³ Homosexuality then is not the product of hormonal abnormalities, but a normal sexual expression that should be appreciated: “The most serious and logical mistake involved in any attempt to explain homosexuality as the product of hormonal abnormalities is the failure to appreciate the way in which habits of sexual expressions are formed.”⁸⁴

In Ford and Beach’s studies homosexual behavior (including pederasty) was found to be pervasively normal and socially acceptable in 49 of 76 human societies. In some societies the passive partner is given homage and esteemed to positions of prestige. In the remaining 26 societies where it meets with disapproval, homosexual activity is either “absent, rare, or carried on only in secrecy.”⁸⁵ Even in subhuman primates and lower mammals (dogs, cats, porpoises, etc.) homoeroticism was visible, although the author could not conclusively determine if masculine homosexual activity was a substitute for “heterosexual coitus sex” since their investigative work was done with animals in a restrictive environment without the opportunity for female contact.⁸⁶ Ford and Beach believe that, since homosexual behavior was practiced by all males in a given uncivilized society and by a percentage of men in our own, then heterosexuality and homosexuality cannot be mutually exclusive or hormonal.⁸⁷

Zoologist Alfred C. Kinsey in *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* holds a liberal view in this discussion. His empirical studies of homosexual behavior in adults in the

⁸³ Caprio, *Female Homosexuality*, 130-133.

⁸⁴ Ford and Beach, *Patterns*, 237.

⁸⁵ Ford and Beach, *Patterns*, 129-133.

⁸⁶ Ford and Beach, *Patterns*, 136.

⁸⁷ Ford and Beach, *Patterns*, 234.

United States led him to determine that ten percent of the male population and 2-6% of the female population are homosexuals.⁸⁸ This widely publicized “urban legend,” according to some scholars,⁸⁹ claims Kinsey’s figures are skewed because 25% of his male samples are incarcerated criminals and sex offenders. A reexamination of Kinsey’s information by other scholars⁹⁰ shows three percent of the population is homosexual. Other research shows a maximum of one percent.⁹¹ Despite the discrepancies the purported myth remains popular in academia, the media and among proponents of homosexuality.

Other psychoanalysts, Irving Bieber and Charles Socarides, reject the inherent bisexuality theory and argue that the etiology of homosexuality emerges from a pathological family bond. Bieber believes this behavior happens at the oedipal stage (3-5 years) and Socarides, the preoedipal stage (1½ -3 years). In *Homosexuality: A Psychoanalytical Study* Bieber studied 106 adolescent homosexual boys, 30 of whom were inpatients, and discovered none was raised in a healthy family structure with a paternal presence. The presence of a father—physically and emotionally—was imaginary and the role of the mother in relationship to her son and daughter were overly intense.⁹²

In their early developmental years until puberty boys explained how their mothers were overprotective, socially restrictive and shielded them from participating in rough

⁸⁸ Alfred Kinsey, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (Philadelphia, PA: W. B. Saunders, 1948), 650-651.

⁸⁹ Judith Reisman and Edward Eichel, *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud* (Lafayette, LA: Huntington House, 1990). The authors believed Kinsey’s research was “scientific fraud” since a greater percentage of the participants were sex offenders and inmates.

⁹⁰ John H. Gagnon and William Simon, *Sexual Conduct* (Chicago, IL: Aldine Press, 1973); cited in Robert Michael et al, *Sex in America: A Definitive Survey* (Boston, MA: Little, Brown).

⁹¹ TraditionalValues.org, “The 10% Is A Lie,” <http://www.traditionalvalues.org/urban/two.php> (accessed March 14, 2012).

⁹² Irving Bieber, *Homosexuality: A Psychoanalytical Study* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 1962), 213.

play with boys their age. Socialization with playmates much younger than themselves including girls was encouraged to eliminate any aggression, says Bieber.⁹³ In 30 cases men expressed fear of their fathers and alienation from him because of physical abuse towards themselves and their mother: “The fathers were described as brutal. Some...were alcoholics and prone to violent rages when drunk. The father would frequently beat his son and sometimes the mother as well.”⁹⁴ Bieber quoted one participant in his study: “When I was three I used to see my father but I didn’t know who he was until my mother told me...I didn’t know what a father was...the last thing I learned to say was ‘Dada.’ I was always afraid of my father when he looked at me.”⁹⁵ In other instances the men explained that their mothers were “frequently seductive,” “discouraged masculine activities and attitudes,” and in contrast encouraged feminine activities and mannerisms in their sons, says the author.⁹⁶ The anomaly in the mother’s behavior towards her son often progressed into incestuous fantasies and sex between mother and son.⁹⁷ That could be in response to three conditions, says Bieber:

- A strained relationship with her husband: “The fathers sometimes dominated the household with tyranny and terror, bolstered by alcohol...Sexual relations between the parents were minimal, occurring in some instances only when the father was drunk and forced himself upon the mother.”⁹⁸
- Her son served as a surrogate for her husband’s affections, and a rival:

⁹³ Bieber, *Homosexuality*, 213.

⁹⁴ Bieber, *Homosexuality*, 213.

⁹⁵ Bieber, *Homosexuality*, 214.

⁹⁶ Bieber, *Homosexuality*, 216.

⁹⁷ Bieber, *Homosexuality*, 215.

⁹⁸ Bieber, *Homosexuality*, 217.

“The father repeatedly expressed concern that the child would take his place...in the mother’s affections.”⁹⁹

- A crushed desire for a daughter when she gave birth to a son resulted in rejection of him: “She had wanted her child to be a girl and was deeply disappointed when she had a boy. For about two years she raised him as a girl...dressing him prettily. Between the ages of two and five (and in one case, fifteen)...it gave her a special kind of pleasure to sleep with the boy.”¹⁰⁰

In Bieber’s interviews with homosexual transvestites and other homosexual boys they revealed their desire to be a man and a father like every other father: “I would prefer not to be a homosexual, but I can’t help myself.”¹⁰¹ The search for same-sex relationships and some homosexuals’ preoccupation with “hyper-masculine postures” can be understood as a search for the masculine ideal, something missing in their lives, the author concedes.¹⁰²

Socarides’ preoedipal theory makes the scenario especially severe when compared to the one supposed by Bieber. In *The Preoedipal Psychoanalytic Therapy of Sexual Perversions* he mentions that at the core of every homosexual is a disorder or “disturbance of the gender-defined self identity.”¹⁰³ The disorder results from the child’s fixation to his mother at the “separation-individuation” phase (1½ -3yrs). Failure to effectively move through this phase creates insecurity and a concentrated level of anxiety

⁹⁹ Bieber, *Homosexuality*, 217.

¹⁰⁰ Bieber, *Homosexuality*, 215. “Two of the boys had slept with the mother up to the time of admission to the hospital while the father slept in another room. One boy described being cuddled in the mother’s arm like a baby at the age of fifteen. These relationships were asexual on the surface but the situation was apparently sexually stimulating.”

¹⁰¹ Bieber, *Homosexuality*, 209.

¹⁰² Bieber, *Homosexuality*, 209.

¹⁰³ Charles Socarides, *The Preoedipal Psychoanalytic Therapy of Sexual Perversions* (Madison, WI: International Universities Press, 1988), 42.

that continues throughout adulthood, which eventually results in a ruptured ego and “faulty gender-defined self identity”:¹⁰⁴

In all sexual deviants there exists a primary identification with the mother, with concomitant sexual (gender) confusion. He feels he cannot survive without her...efforts to separate from the mother result in anxiety. The male child must proceed from the security of [primitive] identification and [biological] oneness with the mother to active competent separateness and male striving.¹⁰⁵

According to Socarides, progression to the oedipal period (primarily 3-4 years of age) without succeeding in the preoedipal period produces another form of identification with the mother and that is “passive feminine” traits for the father: “Beneath this feminine position in relation to the father, one may often uncover the original passive relation with the mother; that is an active feminine preoedipal identification.”¹⁰⁶ Since the first stage of male gender identity is facilitated by identification with the father, Socarides states that it takes both parents to make possible a normal sexual development: the mother must be willing to “relinquish her son’s body and ownership of his penis to the father.”¹⁰⁷ That means the father must be allowed to function in the family in his masculine role and teach his son opposite sex objects as normal. An absentee father or one who fails to function in his masculine role inadvertently prevents his son from achieving “a sense of self and a gender-defined self identity,”¹⁰⁸ says the author. Likewise a mother who asserts dominion over the father and forces him out of his masculine role creates a feeling of male deficiency in her son who does not identify with

¹⁰⁴ Socarides, *Preoedipal Psychoanalytic Therapy*, 43. See also pages 41-42.

¹⁰⁵ Socarides, *Preoedipal Psychoanalytic Therapy*, 43.

¹⁰⁶ Socarides, *Preoedipal Psychoanalytic Therapy*, 46.

¹⁰⁷ Bieber, *Homosexuality: A Psychoanalytical Study*, 48. “Ownership of his penis” is a quote Socarides borrowed from another author, M. S. Mahler *The Selected Papers of Margaret S. Mahler*, vol 2. (1975).

¹⁰⁸ Socarides, *Preoedipal Psychoanalytic Therapy*, 50, 264.

his father's masculinity but is predisposed to female characteristics.¹⁰⁹ At this stage in development the child is visually aware of male and female sexual organs and sees his mother's genitalia as a mutilated penis (cut off by the father he fears), says Socarides. In his study homosexual men expressed fear of their father and felt comforted and secured with other men's penises for it reduced their anxiety of emasculation (an experience or conflict that goes back to when they were three or four years old), says the author.¹¹⁰ He believes that homosexual perversion and progression therefore represent a preoedipal fixation as the homosexual "regresses to those conflicts which have left a weak point or scar formation."¹¹¹

Psychologists Joseph and Linda Ames-Nicolosi, co-authors of *A Parent's Guide to Preventing Homosexuality* and founders of the National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality (NARTH), an interactive internet website,¹¹² share similar views, with special emphasis on paternal abandonment for homosexual causation rather than maternal fixation. In their analysis of Socarides's study they believe "the weak point" or "scar formation" to which homosexual men regress is the connection to a father

¹⁰⁹ Socarides, *Preoedipal Psychoanalytic Therapy*, 50, 264.

¹¹⁰ Socarides, *Preoedipal Psychoanalytic Therapy*, 264. See also page 46.

¹¹¹ Socarides, *Preoedipal Psychoanalytic Therapy*, 46-47.

¹¹² NARTH's message deems society socially irresponsible to label pre-teens and teenagers *gay* because they have tendencies or likenesses for peers of the same sex or may have experimented with the idea. The reason is that pre-adolescent children are at a discovery or investigative phase in their sexual development. The designation of labels can create gender identity confusion for children who do not understand the ramifications of gay identification and whose need really is for guidance and gender affirmation. Several research papers have been made available electronically in favor of "psychological and social influences" as key determinant factors that form a child's sexual identity in their developmental years. Website can be accessed at www.narth.com.

figure in childhood with whom they could identify and the maleness he embodied.¹¹³ In a quest to fill that void in adolescence, they will pursue loving relationships with other men who, in their estimation, represent something they did not achieve, that is, manhood: “He will fall in love with what he has lost by seeking out someone who seems to possess what is missing within himself. This is because what we fall in love with is not the familiar, but the ‘other than me.’”¹¹⁴

The absence of paternal affirmation springs a distorted concept of gender, which is the source of homosexuality, and requires corrective psychological intervention at the pre-homosexual stage. If not, the youngster will experiment with bisexuality, homosexuality or trans-sexuality in an attempt to find his masculinity.¹¹⁵ In their case studies, homosexual men admit how they were ambivalent of their gender when they were boys because of their inborn sensitive traits that were socially consigned to feminine identity.¹¹⁶ They did not feel secure in their gender for they were never affirmed nor were they told that feminine traits do not characterize masculinity nor define gender: “Many had been born sensitive and gentle, and they just were not sure that maleness could be part of who they were.”¹¹⁷

This argument confronts Ellis’s theory that inborn “feminine [personality] characteristics” in boys are definable traits that direct their sexual orientation towards homosexuality. According to the Nicolosis, the failure to receive gender affirmation at

¹¹³ Joseph and Linda Nicolosi, *A Parent’s Guide to Preventing Homosexuality* (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2002), 22.

¹¹⁴ Nicolosi and Nicolosi, *A Parent’s Guide*, 22.

¹¹⁵ Nicolosi and Nicolosi, *A Parent’s Guide*, 22.

¹¹⁶ Nicolosi and Nicolosi, *A Parent’s Guide*, 21-24.

¹¹⁷ Nicolosi and Nicolosi, *A Parent’s Guide*, 21-24

the formative stage of development creates male inferiority and “gender emptiness.”¹¹⁸ Reminiscent of Freud, Bieber and Socarides’s clinical investigation, the Nicolosis point to a healthy nuclear family and the dynamics of that unit, primarily the father, for securing the outcome of a boy’s sexual identity: “Dealing with the problem of pre-homosexuality is a process that must involve every family member....Dad is more important to the boy’s gender-identity development than is Mom.”¹¹⁹ The formation of a homosexual orientation can be prevented if fathers intervene in the developmental years of their son’s life and give male affirmation which is fundamental to growing up “straight.” Nicolosi and Nicolosi state, “The boy’s father has to do his part. He needs to mirror and affirm his son’s maleness. He can play rough and tumble games with his son...or he can take him in the shower with him, where the boy cannot help noticing that Dad has a male body just like he has.”¹²⁰

The Nicolosis claim that by acquainting the son with his own anatomy and affirming his anatomical difference from girls, “he will accept his body as a representation of his maleness” and claim his intended masculine identity as his designed destiny without losing the personality traits with which he was born.¹²¹ If success is not achieved, then a homosexual orientation will begin to form as the boy unconsciously rejects his own body later in adolescence and “will find continuing fascination with the anatomy of other men.”¹²² The incorporation of masculinity into a sense of self boosts

¹¹⁸ Nicolosi and Nicolosi, *A Parent’s Guide*, 21-22.

¹¹⁹ Nicolosi and Nicolosi, *A Parent’s Guide*, 22.

¹²⁰ Nicolosi and Nicolosi, *A Parent’s Guide*, 24.

¹²¹ Nicolosi and Nicolosi, *A Parent’s Guide*, 24-25.

¹²² Nicolosi and Nicolosi, *A Parent’s Guide*, 24.

“gender esteem,” prevents “male inferiority” and isolation from other boys that so many homosexuals acknowledge to have experienced in childhood, says the author.¹²³

Seemingly, fathers who are uninvolved contribute significantly to the early stage of gender distortion.¹²⁴ The Nicolosi’s study aligns with the discontented testimonials of homosexual men in Bieber’s study who attribute their gender divergence to the absence of love and male bonding with their father during childhood, and the continuous nurturing of their mother.¹²⁵ The reclusiveness of the father, as Bieber’s study shows, attracts a mutual dependence between mother and son that may be “proper for infancy,” but inappropriate for the child beyond that stage of development. “If a father wants his son to grow up straight, he has to break the mother-son bond that is proper to infancy but not in the boy’s best interest afterward...the father has to be a model, demonstrating that it is possible for his son to maintain a loving relationship with...his mom, while maintaining his own independence.”¹²⁶ They suggest severing the psychological umbilical cord or “blissful symbiosis” helps the child to develop his own individuation and self-determination.¹²⁷

Holland Gerard Van Den Aardweg in the *American Journal of Psychotherapy* conducted an empirical study of 200 male homosexuals who had undergone therapy and concluded that paternal reclusivity and maternal “overprotectiveness” are not mutually exclusive factors that increase a boy’s chance of developing a homosexual orientation,

¹²³ Nicolosi and Nicolosi, *A Parent’s Guide*, 25.

¹²⁴ Nicolosi and Nicolosi, *A Parent’s Guide*, 31.

¹²⁵ Bieber, *Homosexuality*, 198-204, 213-214.

¹²⁶ Nicolosi and Nicolosi, *A Parent’s Guide*, 27.

¹²⁷ Nicolosi and Nicolosi, *A Parent’s Guide*, 27.

but the combination of both parents' "negative" mind-set produces "maldevelopment." "A detached father is not so disastrous to the boy's feelings of manliness if the mother treats him as a real boy. Conversely, if the father is interested and encouraging, an overconcerned or domineering mother is probably not half so pathogenic."¹²⁸

Seventy-six percent of Aardweg's clients had confessed to having a mother who was oversentimental and a 'critical' father. Eighty-seven percent did not have a 'confidentiality' relationship with their father when growing up. Thirty-eight percent experienced feelings of inferiority in response to their father's hypercriticalness. Sixty percent unconsciously imitated their mother's behaviors and interests. Although the absence of paternal support may have pulled the boys closer to their mother, and female gestures may be apparent, it was not found that the boys "inwardly identified" with femaleness or should be considered feminine in any way, says Aardweg.¹²⁹ What had become evident were "a lack of boyishness or virility" and the presence of "old womanish"¹³⁰ behavior they learned from their mother and from which evolved "the unmanliness complex," states the author. The behavior is therefore attributable to the absence of positive male influence and maternal closeness. Eighty-two percent of Aardweg's clients fall into that category.

While the Nicolosis and Bieber's studies are limited to boys, Peter and Barbara Wyden in *Growing Up Straight* studied the causation of homosexuality in adolescent

¹²⁸ Gerard J. M. Van Den Aardweg, "Parents of Homosexuals—Not Guilty? Interpretation of Childhood Psychological Data," *American Journal of Psychotherapy* 38, no. 2 (April 1984): 180-185.

¹²⁹ Van Den Aardweg, "Parents," 184.

¹³⁰ Van Den Aardweg, "Parents," 184.

girls which does not veer off completely from Nicolosi and Socarides theory.¹³¹ They believe that male inadequacy is the main cause of inversion. Fathers who fail to contribute and assert themselves as strong leaders in the home, particularly where there is a dominant wife, introduce male inadequacy to the pre-lesbian daughter for the first time.¹³² In response to the father's failure, the mother will often implant seeds of male hatred and derogation in her daughter at an early age, with sayings saying such as, "Men are good for nothing...Losers," "You can't trust men," "Don't fool around with them...they will hurt you."¹³³

Wyden says that male bashing and defeminizing her "prehomosexual" daughter is an attempt by the mother to hang onto her as a companion and substitute for her failed husband. The psychology behind the defeminization is a way for the mother to "interfere with her daughter's heterosexuality so she will not be lost to a male later on,"¹³⁴ say the writers. According to the Wydens homosexual orientation is not obvious to detect in the pre-homosexual girl because sexual activity usually manifests at puberty which girls achieve later than boys.¹³⁵ The author cautions that not all girls who are raised in a pathological hostile family environment will turn out to be lesbians.¹³⁶ Each girl's age, traumatic experience, emotional state, and stress level in their formative years are key determinants. "What may be traumatic to one individual in the formative years may

¹³¹ Nicolosi and Nicolosi, *A Parent's Guide*, 27.

¹³² Peter and Barbara Wyden. *Growing Up Straight: What Every Thoughtful Parent Should Know About Homosexuality* (New York, NY: Stein Day, 1968), 76-90.

¹³³ Wyden and Wyden, *Growing Up Straight*, 78.

¹³⁴ Wyden and Wyden, *Growing Up Straight*, 79.

¹³⁵ Wyden and Wyden, *Growing Up Straight*, 74-75.

¹³⁶ Wyden and Wyden, *Growing Up Straight*, 89-90.

make only a slight impression on another person of similar age...the threshold of tolerance may be different in persons in respect not only to the intensity of the stress, but also to the type of stress and to the chronological age of the individual.”¹³⁷ In any case what is reported in the Nicolosis and Wydens’ studies is that the “sexual atmosphere” in the home bears directly on a child’s sexual identification and may advance unwanted homosexual feelings.¹³⁸

But familial, parental and personality variables have little bearing on sexual orientation in women, says Christine Dancey in *Psychological Record*, a proponent of homosexuality.¹³⁹ She too conducted an empirical study of 52 lesbians and 36 heterosexuals to determine whether parental attitude, personality and behavior were predictors of a child’s sexual orientation. The predictor variables on the questionnaire were as follows: “Are you similar to your mother, father, both or neither on feelings, ideas and personality?” “With which parent do you confide more?” and “Was your father or mother negative, positive, strict, protective, supportive or critical?”¹⁴⁰ The responses from both groups were the same. The women were similar and much closer to their mothers. For mothers who were perceived as nurturing and independent, the family environment was healthy. The same holds true for the fathers who were democratic, critical, and authoritative. The women perceived them as positive. Also, the enforcement of traditional sex roles on the child in their developmental years by both parents showed

¹³⁷ Wyden and Wyden, *Growing Up Straight*, 90.

¹³⁸ Wyden and Wyden, *Growing Up Straight*, 90.

¹³⁹ Christine Dancey, “The Influence of Familial and Personality Variables on Sexual Orientation in Women,” *Psychological Record* 40, no. 3 (Summer 1990): 437-449.

¹⁴⁰ Dancey, “Influence,” 437-449.

no significant variations with either lesbian or heterosexual groups. None of the variables had any bearing on “predicting a lesbian or heterosexual choice,” says Dancey.¹⁴¹

Statistically, there appear to be no differences with the personalities of lesbians and heterosexuals whose family backgrounds, attitudes and behaviors are alike. The cause for one group of women to be “emotionally and erotically” fascinated with each other and another to men may be “multifactorial” and “differ from person to person,” for which there isn’t any immediate diagnosis, says the author. When all the variables hold constant, homosexuals and lesbians are no more psychologically disturbed than heterosexuals.¹⁴²

So then change or reparative therapy can be harmful since it assumes “a brokenness” or a “mental disorder,” says Douglas Haldeman in *The Pseudo-science of Sexual Orientation Conversion Therapy*.¹⁴³ According to Haldeman, homosexuals who seek therapeutic intervention to change their sexual orientation are usually pressured by multihomophobic stress factors and the success rate he believes only equates to 30% anyway:

Lesbians, gay and bisexual individuals may be subjected to significant social stress in the form of harassment, violence, and discrimination. These...cause high levels of emotional distress. In light of the considerable stigma it is likely that people attempt to change their sexual orientation because of the aforementioned social stress factors, as well as pressure from family, society, and church.¹⁴⁴

Dennis Altman in *Homosexual Oppression and Liberation* disagrees with

¹⁴¹ Dancey, “Influence,” 437- 449.

¹⁴² Dancey, “Influence,” 437- 449.

¹⁴³ Douglas Haldeman, “The Pseudo-science of Sexual Orientation Conversion Therapy,” *ANGLES: The Policy Journal of the Institute for Gay and Lesbian Strategic Studies* 4, no. 1 (December 1999): 1-4.

¹⁴⁴ Haldeman, “Pseudo-science,” 3.

Bieber's study that parental neglect or a "misadjusted family life"¹⁴⁵ is the causation for homosexuality in pre-homosexual children on the basis that not all homosexuals come from dysfunctional homes: "Too many homosexuals have strong and loving fathers, too many heterosexuals have dominating mothers for any very obvious connection to be seen."¹⁴⁶ According to Altman, it is culturally acceptable for mothers in western culture to exercise domination over their sons, and that is also true for heterosexual sons.¹⁴⁷ With the removal of "sin" and "pathology" the genesis of homosexuality can be embraced as a mysterious concept of identity that cannot be changed therapeutically "without damaging the whole personality,"¹⁴⁸ he says.

Ray Evans in "Parental Relationships and Homosexuality" states that there are other contributing factors for the causation of homosexuality beyond poor parenting skills. According to Evans, Bieber's study is unreliable because the findings are based solely on clinical observations of homosexual patients in psychotherapy and does not represent the general homosexual population.¹⁴⁹ Evans portrays Bieber's study as prejudicial since it does not show the "causal effect" of neglectful parenting on heterosexual children and homosexuals not in psychotherapy: "...no evidence was

¹⁴⁵ Dennis Altman, *Homosexual Oppression and Liberation* (New York, NY: Outerbridge and Dienstfrey, 1971), 4.

¹⁴⁶ Altman, *Oppression*, 4.

¹⁴⁷ Altman, *Oppression*, 4-5.

¹⁴⁸ Altman, *Oppression*, 6-7.

¹⁴⁹ Ray Evans, "Parental Relationships and Homosexuality," *Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality* (April 1971): 164.

presented showing a causal effect of such a pattern, since it is not possible to demonstrate causality from a comparison of one set of associations.¹⁵⁰

Evans replicated Bieber's study with 43 homosexuals and 142 heterosexual volunteers who were randomly selected. An analysis was done on the questionnaire administered and Evans reported no difference in scores between homosexuals' and heterosexuals' responses to the inter-parental and parent-child relationship questions. While the author does not dispute that parental actions do affect the psychological outcome of children, comparatively speaking a "good father relationship" does not prevent homosexuality as much as a "poor father relationship" does not, according to his study. Interestingly, the author states that a homosexual disposition does not emanate solely from dysfunctional parenting, rather a child's inborn characteristic can alter a parent's relationship towards him or her:

Obviously, children are affected by the kind of parents they have, but parents are also influenced by their children. Some consideration must be given to the likelihood that the child's innate [characteristics] at least partially determine parental reactions and attitudes towards him. It is just as tenable to assume that the father becomes detached or hostile because he does not understand his son, [is] disappointed in him or threatened by him, as it is to assume that the son becomes homosexual because of the father's rejection.¹⁵¹

The same hypothesis holds true for mothers who are overprotective and shelter their sons. The behavior of the mother can be stimulated by her son's inborn characteristics rather than him becoming a homosexual because of the mother's intimacy, says the author. "Similarly, it is as reasonable to assume that a mother becomes intimate and close-binding with her potentially homosexual son because of the kind of person he is as to assume he becomes homosexual because she is too binding and intimate with

¹⁵⁰ Evans, "Parental Relationships," 164.

¹⁵¹ Evans, "Parental Relationships," 176.

him.”¹⁵² The author concluded that even if parental neglect was a factor it would not have a substantive effect on infants: “Of course, most parental reactions crucially affecting the child’s personality occur when the child is far too young to be labeled homosexual or heterosexual.”¹⁵³ Other psychologists who support Evans also found no evidence for parental abandonment or abuse for homosexual orientation/causation.¹⁵⁴

Evelyn Hooker in the *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* partially agrees with Evans and maintains that the study of the impact of the parental relationship and homosexuality in children is indefensible and prejudicial since the sampling size is limited to psychiatric cases only.¹⁵⁵ Hooker feels, however, that Evans’s argument does not give enough relevance and weight to the nurturing role of fatherhood in the prevention of homosexuality.¹⁵⁶ She asserts that Evans’s extremely cautious assertions leave his audience on the sideline for he neither confirms nor refutes the etiological role of parent-child relations in the formation of homosexuality in adolescence.¹⁵⁷ Conversely, Bieber’s study was inconclusive because of selective sampling. Hooker in *The Journal of Protective Techniques* conducted an empirical study that allegedly proved through a series of psychological tests that homosexuality was not a sign of a psychological or

¹⁵² Evans, “Parental Relationships,” 176.

¹⁵³ Evans, “Parental Relationships,” 177.

¹⁵⁴ E. Bene, “On the Genesis of Male Homosexuality: An Attempt at Clarifying the Role of the Parents,” *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 111 (1965): 803-813; D. Greenblatt, “Semantic differential analysis of the Triangular System hypothesis in adjusted male homosexuals,” unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1966; L. B. Apperson and W. G. McDoo, Jr. “Parental Factors in the Childhood of Homosexuals,” *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 73 (1968): 201-206.

¹⁵⁵ Evelyn Hooker, “Parental Relations and Male Homosexuality in Patient and Nonpatient Samples,” *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 33, no. 2, (1969): 140-142.

¹⁵⁶ Hooker, “Parental Relations,” 140-142.

¹⁵⁷ Hooker, “Parental Relations,” 141.

pathological disturbance.¹⁵⁸ The tests—Rorschach, Thematic Apperception Test (TAT), and Make-A-Picture-Story (MAPS)—were administered to 30 homosexuals and 30 corresponding heterosexual male subjects. The sample groups were randomly selected from a general populace of comparable age, IQ, education with no psychiatric attachment. The test protocols of both groups were given in pairs to independent rating experts for ratings adjustments without alerting them who the subjects were. The results were as follows: the Rorschach expert could not distinguish between the homosexual and heterosexual subjects and with the TAT and MAPS, even though the homosexuals revealed minimum homosexual experience, the experts could not see any significant difference from their heterosexual counterparts in ratings. This directed Hooker to conclude:

1. Homosexuality as a clinical entity does not exist. Its forms are as varied as are those of heterosexuality.
2. Homosexuality may be a deviation in sexual pattern which is within the normal range, psychologically.¹⁵⁹

In other words, homosexuals are no more inferior or deviant than the general heterosexual population, and if they had a choice over their sexuality, would have chosen to that extent a more socially acceptable heterosexual lifestyle.

John Gonsiorek in *Results of Psychological Testing on Homosexual Populations* followed in the steps of Hooker and states that homosexual behavior has least to do with psychological disturbance in families.¹⁶⁰ In his appraisal of several cases and testing

¹⁵⁸ Evelyn Hooker, "The Adjustment of the Male Overt Homosexual," *Journal of Projective Techniques* 21 (1957): 17-31.

¹⁵⁹ Hooker, "Adjustment," 17-31.

¹⁶⁰ John Gonsiorek, "Results of Psychological Testing on Homosexual Populations," *The American Behavioral Scientist* 25, no. 4 (March/ April 1982): 385.

methods used by scholars to prove homosexuality as a sign of a pathological and psychological disorder, he discovered research design errors, faulty sampling, and studies that were “so seriously flawed as to be useless.”¹⁶¹ A good example would be Krafft-Ebing’s pathological theory based solely on an extreme group of homosexual psychiatric patients. According to Gonsiorek that sample does not represent the general homosexual population, but one that is segmented and discriminatory.¹⁶² Also, Freud’s psychoanalytic theory that depends on recurring family patterns which supposedly predisposes a child toward homosexuality and judges individuals as psychologically disturbed without “reliable, valid, and well-established measures of disturbance” is unjustifiable or “completely unwarranted,” because it does not explain away the variances in the findings.¹⁶³ Variances can mean that a functional nuclear family with both parents and a dysfunctional family with an absentee father both produce a homosexual child. In essence there needs to be in place a measuring scale (psychometric tool) for disturbance by which all groups can be judged instead of a solitary theory to one’s own preferred liking, says the writer. The use of psychometric data taken from homosexual and heterosexual populations is crucial, says Gonsiorek, “because they are the touchstone by which other theories and ideas about homosexuality must be tested.”¹⁶⁴ He believes that the psychological test data are infallible and must be considered by every theory that questions psychological adjustment or disturbance causation in homosexuality.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶¹ Gonsiorek, “Results,” 391.

¹⁶² Gonsiorek, “Results,” 388-389.

¹⁶³ Gonsiorek, “Results,” 385-386.

¹⁶⁴ Gonsiorek, “Results,” 386.

¹⁶⁵ Gonsiorek, “Results,” 386.

Two concepts in psychological testing must be established in order to obtain accurate data, says Gonsiorek. They are “normal range” and “base rates.”¹⁶⁶ To explain the former, a heterosexual and a homosexual may have varying degrees of peculiarity, yet both can be normal. A “normal range” limit for behavior would then need to be established to determine if those differences indicate disturbance. To explain “base rates,” Gonsiorek states that because homosexuality may not be a sign of psychological disturbance does not imply there are no disturbed homosexuals. What it means is the proportion or base rate of disturbed persons in homosexual and heterosexual populace is generally comparable.¹⁶⁷ In the absence of these two concepts, says the author, “researchers can artificially create disturbed individuals of any category: homosexuals, heterosexuals, Presbyterians, etc.”¹⁶⁸ To study the causation of homosexuality the sample group cannot be selective or segmented; neither can disturbance be measured in homosexual groups without comparing the mental health of heterosexuals of the same environment, socio-economic status, or ‘base rate.’ These were the problems Gonsiorek encountered when he reviewed various test research of scholars: discriminating sample group, poor test data designs, and biased interpretation of data.¹⁶⁹ Evelyn Hooker’s study was an exception and was applauded by Gonsiorek.

Ralph Gundlach in the *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* disapproves of Evans’s innate hypothesis, and any genetic or hormonal theory for that

¹⁶⁶ Gonsiorek, “Results,” 387-388.

¹⁶⁷ Gonsiorek, “Results,” 388.

¹⁶⁸ Gonsiorek, “Results,” 388.

¹⁶⁹ Gonsiorek, “Results,” 389-394.

matter, in establishing homosexual orientation in boys.¹⁷⁰ Gundlach, who also participated in Bieber's study, believes Evans misunderstood Bieber's explanation of poor parenting factors that may contribute to homosexuality. The attempt was to "delineate the multivariate factors that may be involved," and not to tie it down to a specific cause, says Gundlach.¹⁷¹ According to Gundlach, a combination of cultural, social, environmental, parental, biological and emotional factors that a child is exposed to from birth affects his or her developmental characteristic and as the child matures in adolescence those factors become callused in their "adult character structure": "In the light of evidence of cultural determination of gender role and sexual practices, the possibility of an innate physical/personality characteristic determining homosexuality seems quite remote."¹⁷²

Scientific Factor

Genetic Evidence

Scientific debates suggest that homosexual orientation involves a genetic and a hormonal disorder caused at birth, therefore sexual variation is natural and is instinctively normal. Dean Hamer, a geneticist of the National Cancer Institute who is also a homosexual and a gay activist, challenged the interfamilial and environmental factor for the etiology of homosexuality and submits a supposition of an inherent "gay gene" that predetermines a person being born homosexual. In his thesis, "A Linkage Between DNA Markers on the X Chromosome and Male Sexual Orientation," Hamer reportedly found a

¹⁷⁰ Ralph Gundlach, "Childhood Parental Relationships and the Establishment of Gender Roles of Homosexuals," *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 33, no. 2 (1969): 136-139.

¹⁷¹ Gundlach, "Childhood Parental Relationships," 137.

¹⁷² Gundlach, "Childhood Parental Relationships," 137-139.

gene to be the cause for homosexuality in males.¹⁷³ In a pedigree and family linkage analysis of 114 families of homosexual men, homosexual orientation was found to be prevalent in men on their maternal side only which suggests a female gene “sex-linked transmission” in a percentage of people, says Hamer. Included in the sample size was a DNA study on 40 sibling pairs of homosexual brothers, their parents and extended relatives. According to the subjects’ assessment, 69 percent of the males in their families (whether fathers, uncles, or cousins) were rated five or six on the Kinsey scale for exclusive homosexuality and 27 percent were believed not to have a genetic homosexual trait. The measurement was corroborated by subsequent interviews with the families. By contrast, the rates for homosexual orientation in the male relatives on the paternal side of these subjects averaged three percent. The testing of relatives living outside of the home who share the same DNA would be relevant to make the case that homosexuality has a genetic rather than an environmental causation.

According to the X chromosome linkage, males have two sex chromosomes: Y inherited from the father’s side and X inherited from the mother’s side. Hamer’s data revealed maternal transmission of a “male-limited trait” that links “homosexual orientation and the inheritance of polymorphic markers on the X chromosome” in more than half of the subjects tested.¹⁷⁴ A gene located at the tip of the mother’s X chromosomal region carries a trait shared by a large percentage of the homosexual brothers tested. This gene is believed to cause male sexual orientation, says Hamer.¹⁷⁵ Conceivably then, if homosexual orientation is a trait that is genetically predisposed, then

¹⁷³ Dean Hamer, et al., “A Linkage Between DNA Markers on the X Chromosome and Male Sexual Orientation,” *Science* 261, no. 5119 (July 1993): 321-327.

¹⁷⁴ Hamer, “Linkage,” 321-327.

¹⁷⁵ Hamer, “Linkage,” 321-327.

families and relatives who share this gene will more than likely also share the sexual trait. Hamer's study is significant to the gay agenda because it holds strong social, political and potentially legal ramifications. Some homosexuals and lesbians are persuaded that they have no choice in deciding their same-sex preference, i.e. they were born gay. If this study is accurate then an argument can be made to justify the legality of same-sex marriage and gay adoption on the grounds that homosexuality and heterosexuality are comparably equal.

But like any other scientific study, replication is needed. George Rice, a neuroscientist at the University of Western Ontario, challenges Hamer's report based on a new linkage study in Canada. In his thesis "Male Homosexuality: Absence of Linkage to Microsatellite Markers," Rice studied 52 pairs of gay male siblings from 48 families. His focus on the chromosomal region found "no link that supports an X-linked gene underlying male homosexuality."¹⁷⁶ The study concluded, "It is unclear why our results are so discrepant from Hamer's original study. Because our study was larger than that of Hamer et al., we certainly had adequate power to detect a genetic effect as large as was reported in that study. Nonetheless, our data do not support the presence of a gene of large effect influencing sexual orientation at position Xq28."¹⁷⁷ Other scientists also duplicated Hamer's study and like Rice they too could not corroborate his results.¹⁷⁸

Biological Evidence

¹⁷⁶ George Rice, et al., "Male Homosexuality: Absence of Linkage to Microsatellite Markers Xq28," *Science* 284 (1999): 665-67.

¹⁷⁷ Rice, "Male Homosexuality," 665-67.

¹⁷⁸ Neil Risch, et al., "Male Sexual Orientation and Genetic Evidence," *Science* 262, no. 5142 (1993): 2063-2065.

Support for a neurological and hormonal causation for homosexual orientation is popular among homosexual men and women when questioned about their sexual orientation. Some say that they had known since infancy that they were different from other kids and that their sexual attraction for the same sex was a normal deviance in later years. This leads to the debate that homosexuality is hard-wired in the human brain. Simon LeVay, a neuroscientist, studied the brain in sexual orientation and came up with the theory that homosexuality is a biological phenomenon. He wrote in “A Difference in Hypothalamic Structure Between Heterosexual and Homosexual Men” that same-sex feelings are controlled by the “developmental structure and function of the brain circuits” that release hormones, thus making the hypothalamic structure of the brain the determinant factor for a person’s sexual orientation.¹⁷⁹ In layman’s terms, ‘my genes made me do it.’ The study was comprised of brain tissue taken from corpses of homosexual, bisexual, and heterosexual men and women who died from AIDS-related complications as well as unknown causes. LeVay claimed that when he studied the cluster of neurons in the region of the brain that control “male-typical sexual behavior” he found the measurement more than doubled in size in heterosexual men in contrast to women (which is typical), but was strangely twice as large in heterosexual men when compared to homosexual men. The study indicates the region of the brain that drives sexual behavior in homosexual men is found to have a smaller female structure rather than a larger composition characteristic of heterosexual men. LeVay’s assumption is that

¹⁷⁹ Simon LeVay, “A Difference in Hypothalamic Structure Between Heterosexual and Homosexual Men,” *Science*, New Series 253, no. 5023 (August 30, 1991): 1034-1037. LeVay’s complete study was also accessed on January 31, 2012 at <http://www.members.aol.com/slevay>.

sexual orientation has a “dimorphic trait” and that “homosexual men have a female programming” more than likely established prior to birth.¹⁸⁰

William Byne, a neuroscientist and psychiatrist, challenged LeVay’s “flawed” homosexual programming theory in his thesis “The Biological Evidence Challenged.” Byne argued that sexual orientation is not dimorphic as LeVay theorized, but it is more diverse and behavior subjective to varied interpretations such as religion, family, personal events and societal culture. For example, cultural homosexual rituals in New Guinea subject all young males to intercourse. They are to provide oral sexual stimulation and ingest semen of adult males as an initiation into manhood and for attaining warrior status. Byne believes that those elements that motivate human desire for the same-sex have more to do with the individual’s interaction with their environment at an early stage in life that moulds their personality and less to do with any one person’s brain construct.¹⁸¹ Byne also criticized Hamer’s genetic evidence that sexual orientation is a “heritable trait.”¹⁸² According to Byne, should Hamer’s finding prove conclusive it would still lack proper analysis “about how the heritability of the gene might operate.”¹⁸³ The link between genes, behavior and brain circuitry as it contributes to sexual orientation is virtually incomprehensible and demands further research, says Byne: “genes in themselves specify proteins, not behavior or psychological phenomena.”¹⁸⁴ In the case of LeVay’s research Byne determined that even if the brain measurement variations are true for

¹⁸⁰ LeVay, “A Difference in Hypothalamic Structure,” 1035-1036.

¹⁸¹ William Byne, “The Biological Evidence Challenged,” *Scientific American* (May 1994): 50-55.

¹⁸² Byne, “Evidence,” 55.

¹⁸³ Byne, “Evidence,” 55.

¹⁸⁴ Byne, “Evidence,” 55.

homosexual and heterosexual men the speculation does not explain how the variation in size could produce qualitative differences in sexual orientation. “Even if the size of certain brain structure does turn out to be correlated with sexual orientation, current understanding of the brain is inadequate to explain how such quantitative differences could generate qualitative differences in a psychological phenomenon as complex as sexual orientation.”¹⁸⁵

Psychiatrist John Bancroft in his article “Homosexual Orientation” is also critical of both LeVay and Hamer’s studies. He supports a psychosocial cause for homosexuality and not a biological determinant. In the case of LeVay’s study he claims that there cannot be any direct relationship between biology and homosexual orientation because the research sample size was inadequate, the findings were non-reproducible, and the variation in brain structure could be a consequence of the AIDS disease.¹⁸⁶ Byne is skeptical of any biological linkage to homosexual orientation when there is insufficient “innate” evidence in other species. As for Hamer’s genetic theory he believes that case was not proven because the outcome could not be replicated. The Nicolosi also reduced LeVay’s unsubstantiated hypothesis to pure speculation for it had not been proven whether the emaciated brain of homosexuals was due to “the gay men’s active HIV infection.”¹⁸⁷

The claim in the gay community that scientific research has established a genetic link in homosexual behavior seems to be without merit. The replication of studies has

¹⁸⁵ Byne, “Evidence,” 55.

¹⁸⁶ John Bancroft, “Homosexual Orientation,” *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 164, (1994): 437- 440.

¹⁸⁷ Nicolosi and Nicolosi, *A Parent’s Guide*, 55.

produced confusion for the claims cannot be substantiated. The only proven and constant fact from scientific studies is that the brain structure of a man is larger than his female counterpart. The pendulum may swing in favor of psychotherapists who claim that the deeper causation for homosexuality is a dysfunctional and unstable family structure and dynamic, rather than a discriminating biological gene. Yet all is speculative hypothesis.

CHAPTER FOUR

PROJECT DESIGN

Presented in this chapter are two seminars that present biblical views on homosexual practice. Whether the issue is same-sex marriage, homosexual orientation or homosexual lifestyle, several texts assertively respond to the ancient discussion that does not affirm same-sex copulation. Genesis 1 and 2 deal with the creation of sexual identity and sexual covenant. Leviticus 18:22-30 and Romans 1:18-28 are also scriptures which reveal that both authors knew and understood the will and grace of God for human sexuality and the significance of preserving the covenantal relationship between a man and a woman. The marriage covenant is meant to mirror the human-God covenant and the Christ-Church covenant. That covenant transcends time and culture. In an act of endorsement and shared conviction the author of Romans submits to the Levitical writer's precision in censuring homosexual unions and admonishment for holy living, both critical for the preservation of divine favor. Beneath the serious rhetorical discourse between divinity and humanity is God's pervasive love and vast plan for humanity, often overshadowed by human will.

The prospect for these materials is that they would serve as models for pastors and colleagues on how to approach with sensitivity the complex debate on homosexuality by:

- Communicating God's love and his thought-out plan for human sexuality.
- Celebrating God's design for sexual intimacy.
- Pointing to Jesus as the reconciler, redeemer and restorer of human sexual brokenness.
- Placing an emphasis on God's grace: "While we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Romans 5:8).

To ensure that the lecture materials satisfy these objectives an appraisal document is provided in Appendix 2. It is comprised of 49 questions which are qualitative and narrative in form. The evaluation form will be distributed to the seminar attendees at the end of the seminar.

How to Preach to Teens About Homosexual Practice in a Tolerant World

God's standard of morality supercedes the world's standard of morality. Aim for His and you will automatically meet and exceed the world's.

—Lorna Graham

The Purpose of the Seminar

Marriage in American society has been redefined in recent years to include homosexual unions. Once considered an aberration in American culture, homosexuality is endorsed in public school curriculums not only as a lifestyle, but as a sexual design equivalent to procreative heterosexuality. At an elementary age students are indoctrinated to accept homosexual practice as a normal way of life. Mainstream youth recreation has been inundated with homosexual oriented television shows that depict teens experimenting with gay sex, falling in love with same sex classmates, “coming out of the closet” and discovering that to be *gay* is *cool*. The gay idea is presented in an affirming way as the new “straight” and as natural.

The pendulum swing to legalize homosexual marriage as a fundamental right in states such as Massachusetts triggers a theological concern for the Orthodox Christian Church. That is: how can pastors preach effectively to teens about the dangers of homosexual practice in a tolerant society? The answer is through expository preaching that encapsulates the concept of the biblical text,¹ a careful exegesis of the scripture and

¹ Haddon Robinson, *Biblical Preaching*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2001), 23.

youth culture, and making the ancient text relevant to a 21st-century internet-driven youth audience: “We must know the people as well as the message, and to acquire that knowledge, we exegete both the Scripture and the congregation.”²

That is the purpose of this seminar: to explore the relevance of the scriptural message concerning homosexual practice for today’s generation and to execute the fundamentals of expository preaching for the purpose of teaching/preaching to youth audiences.

The Goal of the Seminar

The goal of the seminar is to teach pastoral leadership to communicate effectively to youth audiences why homosexuality opposes the will of God for human sexual relationship.

Who Should Attend

The seminar is designed for experienced pastoral leaders who practice orthodox Christianity and have some formal homiletical training in an academic setting. Exceptions may be given to church educators/teachers who might not possess ministerial credentials but are desirous of learning and developing the skills necessary to teach on this sensitive subject matter.

Seminar Sessions

This is a two-day workshop comprised of three sessions. The first day convenes Friday evening at 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. At this meeting we will establish homosexual behavior as a human moral failure. The second day has two meetings. Session II convenes Saturday morning at 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. In this meeting we will develop a theological construct for heterosexual relationship. Session III will convene in the

² Robinson, *Biblical Preaching*, 28.

afternoon at 1:15 p.m. to 3:15 p.m. In this meeting we will explore the various theocratic understandings that produce homosexual constructs and discuss the sufficiency of God's grace for the redemption of fallen humanity. Sessions II and III will commence with a word search puzzle covering the previous class material. The learning environment is interactive and includes an exploration and demonstration of ideas through short play scripts.

Seminar I – Teaching Outline
First Session: Friday, 6:30 P.M. – 9:00 P.M.

Introduction to each other, state the seminar goals and objectives. Chapter two covers extensively the moral attributes of God and can be referenced for this seminar.

Desired Outcome for this Session:

To set a precedent to teach kids that sin is a violation of God's moral law.
--

First Goal

By the end of this session students will be able to provide a biblical definition of morality.

Teaching Strategies—Goal #1

1. Define in your own words what “morals” means.

Example: Morals are cultural or personal values, core beliefs, principles, laws, that differentiate between right and wrong.

2. Discuss ways in which citizens break the laws of the land and what some of the consequences are.

Example: Ignore the speed limit/run a red light = ticket, revoke license
Texting while driving = fine
Disobey a police officer = possible arrest
Steal, kill = jail, prison

3. Let students share their own experience of violating their parents' rules in the home and what was the outcome.

4. Provide examples of how your understanding of morals relates to behavior.
5. Give an example of a situation where you had to make a moral decision. What formed the basis of your judgment?

Example: family values – parental teachings
biblical values – church teachings
your emotions – peer pressure/ friends influence

6. Explore three biblical texts or stories where God established moral principles. What was the high point of each case?
 - Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden (Genesis 2:8-9, 15-17; 3:1-24)
 - Ten Commandments (Exodus 20:1-17)
 - Immoral relationships (Leviticus 18:22-30)
7. Explain what the Bible teaches about morals
 - God is moral
 - God expects us to be moral
 - No expiration date on morality
 - God's moral standard is to 'keep the peace' in society
 - God gives us choices to make the right moral decision
 - Consequences are attached to morals – obedience leads to rewards, disobedience results in sanctions
8. Illustrate in what ways God's view of morality differs from the world's view
 - God's view is biblical - absolute/universal and not situational.
 - the world's view is regulated/relative – if it doesn't harm anyone then it is acceptable:

Example: Moral judgment is used to legalize abortion, same-sex marriage, etc.

9. Group Exercise—Tap into your ingenuity and in pairs or groups create a play that addresses one of the following issues of morality:
 - a) Present the Fall of Adam and Eve as an exercise in morality. Students will identify the moral code in the story, when it was broken and what was the consequence.
 - b) Present the story of Sodom and Gomorrah as an exercise in morality. Identify the moral code in the story, how it was broken and what was the consequence.

- c) During school lunch break your friend tells you of his/her plan to experiment with homosexuality. On what basis would you convince your friend to change his/her mind?
- d) You are invited to attend your friend's homosexual "coming out" party. Your goal is not to convert, but to inform others—in a non-confrontational way—of God's love as it relates to homosexuality.

Second Goal

Students will be able to explain how sin violates God's moral law and the consequences involved.

Teaching Strategies—Goal #2

1. Define in your own words what "sin" is

- What causes us to sin? = d-i-s-o-b-e-d-i-e-n-c-e

An unsundered heart

An unsundered heart produces rebellion

Rebellion = doing what our friends and society say is "cool"
irrespective of what God says is right

- How can we avoid sinning? = o-b-e-d-i-e-n-c-e

Surrender our hearts to God

Resist the Devil and he will leave you alone

Obey God because you love him and not just believe in him

- What does it mean to be obedient to God?

Honor God's will

Honor God's Word

Honor God's Spirit

- Why you should obey God.

Obedience sets you on the course to peace

Obedience is the secret to abundant living

Obedience sets you up for future favor

2. Make the connection between obeying your parents and obeying God.

Example: Obey your parents and enjoy the benefits of longevity.
The length of your life can be affected by obeying God.

Example: Obey God and enjoy his endless blessing.

Seminar II – Teaching Outline
Second Session: Saturday, 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 a.m.

Chapter two of the thesis provides an in-depth biblical perspective on sexual relationships.

Desired Outcome for this Session:
Students will understand the divine order for sexual relationship.

First goal

As a focusing technique students will be given a word puzzle from the previous session to refresh their memory of what they just learned to prepare them for the next session.

Teaching Strategies—Goal #1

Handout Word Search Puzzle quiz. Students have 15 minutes to find as many words as possible. They will swap papers and grade each other's quiz. See Appendix 1 for quiz.

Second Goal

Students will explain why we believe that violating God's moral law is also a violation of the divine order in the creation of things:

Teaching Strategies—Goal #2

1. Explain the perfect, functional and orderly construct of the universe

Example: Planets orbit the sun with no planetary collision (Psalm 19:1-7)
Moon orbits the earth with precision

2. Discuss the perfect construct of the family and the order of reproduction.

Example: Sexual reproduction in plants is dependent upon fertilization. Fertilization in plants requires cross pollination, that is, the transfer of sperm cell to the egg cell.

Example: Sexual reproduction in animals is dependent upon fertilization. Fertilization in animals requires the fusion of the male and female cells during sexual reproduction.

Example: Sexual reproduction in humans is dependent upon fertilization. Fertilization in humans requires an egg and a sperm.

3. Illustrate how the world subscribes to God's order even if they don't admit to it.

- Make a correlation between the radio and plug connection and same-sex union
 - i) the wall outlet is referred to as the female receptacle
 - ii) the prongs of the plug are called the male end
 - iii) when joined together they complete a circuit/conduct electricity
 - iv) two positive ends/same current/same-sex results in a short circuit
 - v) same-sex unions defy the energy needs the current provides

4. Examine why homosexual relationships challenge the created order.

- Gender is irrelevant
- Sexual reproduction is impossible – no creative power, erasing God's image
- Sexual use of the body deviates from the created order
- Sexual intercourse is worthless/self-gratifying love/idolatrous – cult of love or the idolatry of love

5. Describe how Satan perverted the divine order (evil is the corruption of the good).

- Satan deceives that things are going to be better than they appear
- Satan offers an alternative to the "good" or "perfect"
- Satan's offer is always a counterfeit of the real (Romans 1:20)

Third Goal

Students will know that to be created in God's image and likeness means that God created us a little lower than himself, therefore, we have the same inherent spiritual and intellectual capacity to distinguish between good and evil.

Teaching Strategies—Goal #3

1. Define what image is - "A reflection or representation of the form of a person or thing."
2. Explain what qualities characterize the image of God.
 - a. Holy (a spirit being)
 - b. Righteous
 - c. Perfect
 - d. All-knowing
 - e. All-powerful
 - f. Wisdom
3. Explain what qualities constitute the likeness of God
 - a. Intelligence
 - b. Imagination
 - c. Creativity
 - d. Morality
 - e. Ability to capture and decipher truth
 - f. Freedom to choose between what is right and what is wrong
4. Compare the ways in which we resemble the image and likeness of God.

Example: In image we can be holy

In likeness we are rulers and executors of God's will on the earth

5. List the things Adam learned about himself being in God's image (Genesis 2:1-21)

Example: Adam was smart and discerning

Adam discerned female and male gender pairs among the animals

Adam recognized it takes a male and female to produce a family

Adam discovered he was the only one of his kind

Adam experienced loneliness. He wanted a family

6. List your discernible strengths and weaknesses

- Confidence comes by knowing who you are
- Once you know who you are you are less likely to compromise your values
- Your values will guide you towards the divine order of things.

Fourth Goal

By the end of this session students will appreciate, through the scripture, God's celebration of male and female relationships.

Teaching Strategies—Goal #4

1. Discuss how God solved Adam's loneliness problem.
2. Point out the uniqueness of Adam and Eve's relationship
 - They were a sexual complement
 - Sexual orientation towards each other was natural
 - Adam and Eve existed as one flesh, or a whole
 - The relationship was a divine design
3. Explain why marriage between a man and a woman is sacred.
 - God is called upon as a witness to the vow
 - The sexual union typifies the relationship between God and Israel
 - The sexual union is figurative of the relationship between Jesus and the Church

Fifth Goal

In pairs, students will develop an argument why homosexual relationships should be rejected today.

Teaching Strategies—Goal #5

1. Become aware of the prevailing reason why God cannot affirm gay and lesbian relationships.

Clue: Homosexuality is self-worship or idolatry
God cannot affirm idolatry because it is not in his nature

2. Teach children reasons why Christians should not affirm gay relationships or multi-sexual family makeup as natural.
3. Group Exercise - If possible, obtain DVD for in-class presentation. If not, the transcript below should suffice.

The storyline for the tenth episode of the sixteenth season of *The Simpsons*, “There’s Something About Marrying,” centered on the legal right for same-sex couples to marry. Homer, the main character, becomes an “e-Piscopal” minister online and makes the case for gay marriage. He calls for same-sex weddings, solicits for partners and marries homosexual couples in the town of Springfield in order to boost tourism. When ridiculed by Rev. LoveJoy, a conservative Christian, Homer mocks the Bible and challenges the authority of scripture concerning same-sex relationships. The story proceeds with the *coming out* and *making out* of gay characters. In the story, homosexuality is spoken of as “an expression of love in its most purest form” and that God does not care whether both couples have the same “hoo-hoo or ha-ha.” Marriage, as it is offered in the cartoon, is meaningless and is about anything as long as it exists.

Well, is that true? Is homosexual love, “pure”? Does God not care about same-sex relationships? Should marriage be exclusively heterosexual? Is Rev. LoveJoy’s argument legitimate or dismissive? Be imaginative. In groups of three, tap into your creative spirit and produce a play in response to *The Simpsons*, “There’s Something About Marrying” episode.

Third Session: Saturday, 1:15 p.m.–3:15 p.m.

Chapter three of the thesis covers various factors that are attributed to homosexual orientation. God’s redemptive plan for the salvation of fallen humanity is also covered.

Desired Outcome for this Session:
Students will realize God’s love and saving grace for homosexuals

First Goal

As a focusing technique, students will be given a word puzzle from the previous session to refresh their memory of what they just learned to prepare them for the next session.

Teaching Strategies—Goal #1

Handout Word Search Puzzle quiz. Students have 15 minutes to find as many words as possible. They will swap papers and grade each other's quiz. See Appendix 1 for quiz.

Second Goal

Students will learn that having an inclination or orientation to sin is no excuse for disobeying God's word.

Teaching Strategies—Goal #2

1. Discuss how exposure to sin can influence how we think and behave but does not decide the course of our life.

What are some of sin's influences?

- Inherited birth defect: handicap, mental illness, genetic disorder
 - Childhood sexual abuse
 - Neglectful dad/over nurturing mom
 - Peer pressure/change in laws
2. Reflect on God's healing power for persons who have been affected or scarred by sin's influence.
 3. Explain how God's power restrains us from sinning.
 4. Discuss God's predestined will for us to be holy and blameless before Him in love (Ephesians 1:4-5), that is, in his image.

Third Goal

Teaching Strategies—Goal #3

Explain God's message of redemption and hope for spiritual transformation of homosexuals.

1. What does redemption mean?
What does redemption imply?
What does it mean to be transformed?
2. Show how homosexuality is deeply rooted in disobedience and the need for redemption.

Example: Discuss the fall of Adam and Eve and how our conscious as well as subconscious judgments can be impaired by sin.

3. Explain the need for God's grace.

- Define what Grace means

Give an illustration: You owe a debt to a friend that you cannot possibly pay back. A total stranger comes along and bails you out free of charge, with no strings attached.

- What makes Grace possible

Fourth Goal

Establish how conversion from homosexuality is made possible through salvation by faith in Jesus Christ.

Teaching Strategies—Goal #4

1. Define what salvation is and what it means to everyone.
2. Describe in your words what "faith" means.
3. Emphasize the importance of salvation and freedom from sin in Jesus Christ.
4. Discuss how Jesus' death atones for all sin, including homosexuality.

Fifth Goal

Provide a full class evaluation of the seminar and what was learned.

*See Appendix 2 for seminar evaluation form.

CHAPTER FIVE

OUTCOME

Fifteen persons were chosen to participate in a presentation of the project outlined in chapter four. Eleven are preachers, including a professor and three are Sunday school youth teachers. The remaining participant formerly worked in the judicial branch of government and was a little hesitant to take part in the beginning. Eventually he obliged, but after the second meeting decided not to continue with the project for fear that his view and position as a (one time) federal judge might be compromised. The age group ranged between 28 and 60 years old. The gender make up was split down the middle. All but four participants had children younger than 12 years of age.

The author formally met with each individual at their local church for two hours. During that time the introduction to the course was presented and the objectives were discussed. The teachers were given four weeks to review, provide constructive criticisms, annotate and construct a Sunday school lesson for their youth group based on the outline which was provided. The thesis itself was not supplied, neither was it presented in full. A brief summary of each chapter was communicated which proved in most cases to be inadequate. This was a predictable, built-in deficiency since the participants had no way of verifying the information by cross referencing each point.

Each participant contributed invaluable feedback on the outline. When asked to assess the weaknesses and strengths of the material, the time allotment for Seminar II, 9am to noon, was deemed insufficient. Most believed that the lesson on “Understanding the Divine Order for Sexual Relationships” was the most important part of the seminar, but that the three hours did not allow students the opportunity to delve deeper into their

thoughts. Complaints concerning the unavailability of the thesis to verify and cross reference essential points was expected and noted. One individual did not feel that God's unconditional love and his ability to love unconditionally was warmly demonstrated in the material: "We need to cultivate love when dealing with people with a sin like homosexuality."

The professor, on the other hand, showed concern on the trainability of the presenter to be "firm yet loving" because the effectiveness of the message depends on an effective ("warm") delivery. The author acknowledges the importance of conveying empathy in language, tone and body, the fundamentals for effective communication. Building effective communication skills requires daily practice, and practice will make permanent. Improvement in this area is ongoing.

Several persons mentioned that the scriptures were sparse and in some cases not referenced at all in the outline: "Providing the scriptures would give a better understanding of God's Word and also to keep the message Christ-centered." This oversight is easily correctable. In any case, they all agreed based on their academic background that the theology of the lesson was informed by biblical theology, therefore the lesson was in accord with the Word of God. The major strength was the footnotes in the outline. They proved to be a resource which will help in future research.

Six participants felt the material was teen-appropriate and suggested developing a seminar suitable for kindergarteners since the development of self-worth early in life is critical for making healthy decisions in the future. The professor, who is also a former high school teacher, felt the seminar had a strong youth appeal to those who are "questioning their sexuality" as it provides "information they need about good sexual

identity.” The seminars should also provide a helpful resource for pastors who are searching for techniques for teaching youth on the topic of homosexuality. The professor also suspected that “homosexuals who are on the edge will be responsive” and that families will have enough substantive “information for discussion with their children.” Four respondents felt that the material was applicable to all audience types and would engage both sides, though the activities might be varied for a less youthful audience. Two persons felt that the material was geared more toward a young adult age group between 17-20 rather than teenagers 13-17. One person was confused and felt the target audience and outcomes were unclear throughout. Everyone believed the topic was relevant for today and even recommended some other inclusions.

A couple of participants felt that a little more philosophical argument, broken down for the youthful recipients, would strengthen the case. Several people also suggested the need to formulate questions on “what it means to fear God, why it is necessary to revere Him and how one can learn to do so.” The group felt this was important since we live in a culture where even some preachers have been tempted to synchronize the Word of God with popular culture. Someone suggested contrasting the rebellious nature of Satan, and how it is the antithesis of God’s nature. That is why Satan entices youth to be rebellious to their parents by experimenting with sinful behavior. After all, he is the father of rebellion.

One respondent stated that Seminar I ended rather abruptly. A reflective exercise was proposed to allow the participants to wind down for the evening. Seminar II, which addresses the divine order in the creation of things, would require extra academic preparation, said one participant. Should questions about the intrusion of meteors into the

earth's atmosphere be raised causing some of the earth's current topography, the author would be unprepared. However, since the lecture is geared towards teenagers, the prospect of 13-year-olds introducing a geological hypothesis into the discussion is improbable. The group exercise in seminar II was a strong point and a "good teaser for discussion," stated one person, who also emphasized the need for the author to be philosophical and logical so she would be biblical in leading the discussion because discussions in morality require "robust logic and intellect." That would be an invitation for students involved in the seminar and ultimately the youths on HOW to think.

On the subject of God's love and saving grace for homosexuals, it was pointed out by a few that the author should be prepared to answer questions from the audience. Participants might ask about persons whom they know to be believers, yet are tormented by their homosexual condition and wanting to change, but not seeing that change. The author must also consider how to answer questions concerning believers who are celibate, but who are haunted by a homosexual desire. Examples should quote real persons who not only converted from a homosexual lifestyle to Christianity, but from gay to straight. The author is aware and makes mention in the thesis of Exodus International, a Christian organization which cites the testimony of homosexuals who have experienced change or freedom from homosexuality through the power of salvation.

The vote was unanimous that the exposition on grace was necessary and that the author should consider expanding on that, especially with Christians who are genuinely struggling with breaking the habit of the homosexual lifestyle. Grace is necessary for those wrestling with the orientation that was identified as being *no excuse for disobeying the law*: "It may look like a loss for the integrity of the faithful, but it scores one for

God's grace and love," said one pastor who would rather not take a position on the debate. He would prefer to look at the Sodom and Gomorrah text in Ezekiel chapter 16, where Sodom is condemned, not for homosexuality, but for pride. The pastor resolved that the gay issue was not going away, but was not easy to preach on. The church may well be in a season of having to wrestle long and hard with its presence among the faithful and in the world. He compared homosexuality to Paul's *thorn in the flesh* (2 Corinthians 12:7-10) – a messenger of Satan, for which homosexuals ask, like Paul, for relief, but were told, "No." God's grace is sufficient to keep them. John Shelby Spong, an Episcopal Bishop, theorized that Paul was a closeted homosexual who throughout his ministry struggled with his sexual orientation. He proposed that the evil or "thorn" was Paul's repressed homosexuality that needed to be expressed.¹

The participant also cautioned that conversion should never be communicated as "a piece of cake." He also suggested this author be more aware of non-biblical arguments that support a healthier sexual lifestyle.

¹John Shelby Spong, *Rescuing the Bible from Fundamentalism: A Bishop Rethinks the Meaning of Scripture* (San Francisco, CA: Harper, 1991), 116. The assumption that Paul's "thorn in the flesh" is equivalent to closet homosexuality must be rejected. God called the children of Israel "thorns" and warned the prophet Ezekiel against their rebellion: they were messengers of Satan whose assignment was to arouse fear, intimidate, harass and frustrate his ministry (Ezekiel 2:6). In Judges 2:3, God referred to Israel's enemies as "thorns in your sides" (AMP) and "snares" which he allowed and would not remove in order to humble them. The language in both scenarios fits the descriptive nature of Paul's thorn: 1. A messenger of Satan – enemies who oppose God's work; 2. The enemy's purpose is to buffet – to strike with a clenched fist. Paul carried around the evidence of torture on his body (Galatians 6:17): beaten with rods, stoned, shipwrecked, fearing the danger of wicked men, even his own countrymen (2 Corinthians 11:25-26), imprisoned (Acts 24:24-27), naked, homeless, hungry, thirsty, stalked, persecuted, slandered, wounded, etc. (1 Corinthians 4:10-13, AMP). Paul was under attack and prayed for relief from his enemies, the messengers of Satan. Instead, God assured him that His grace was sufficient to keep him against any danger, and would enable him to bear it (2 Corinthians 12:9, AMP). Paul's perception of his troubles and troublemakers changed (v. 10). In his physical weakness he found power in God's strength. Nowhere does the scripture allude to Paul's "thorn" as a moral disorder or mental illness.

Were this outline to be presented again, a different variety of focus exercises would be considered, so as to avoid the use of the same techniques used before. A stronger moral argument that appeals to common sense and community spirit is necessary to bridge the relevance of the ancient text. The appeal was solely to the biblical text, about which some youths are skeptical today. It is also practical that an appeal to reason or one's intellect might encourage youths to think.

The author could have belabored the health risk associated with the homosexual lifestyle and the often-raised legal issues, political issues, societal policy and how society gauges its comfort level with these matters. The fact is those points were addressed at the onset and later truncated to honor the institution's policy for thesis length and time.

The project succeeded because it did not compromise the truth of God's Word. It did not minimize sin, but confronted it straightforwardly. The author agrees with some of the respondents that sexual immorality can be difficult to address from the pulpit, especially when we live in a society that tolerates sin and a judicial system that legislates sexual immorality from the bench. The preacher is in an uncomfortable zone talking about this subject if his or her sermon is popularity-driven. The question is, do we preach Christ for genuine conversion of souls and suffer the label, "homophobe?" Or do we pander to facilitate an unhealthy need for human acceptance? In Leviticus, chapters 9 and 10, the priests Nadab and Abihu offered a fire (burnt offering) unto the Lord which God did not authorize them to do. It was called a *profane* (KJV) or *strange fire* (AMP). God's fire fell and killed them. Preachers today must be compelled to preserve the integrity of the Gospel of Jesus Christ and say like the apostle Paul, "Woe is me, if I do not!" (1

Corinthians 9:16). Hopefully, this study will start a good conversation. Enough seeds for thought and action have been sown.

APPENDIX 1

WORD SEARCHES

Sin Is a Violation of God's Moral Law By Rev. Lorna Graham

Words associated with “Sin Is A Violation of God's Moral Law” are hidden. Can you find them all in 15 minutes?

L G A E C S I A N I N N D E A L T N E
S M O L I O I D B U G O M O R R A H A
E O I D U M O I P S G N I S S E L B N
N O L I S E M S E E O W E T A B N T A
I B E H O V O O W U A L O L A E T U N
L O M N R L I B R L R C U L W L L L R
V P N R N T N E M A T S E T D L O L L
O I E L O A D D W V L R E N E I E I E
E L A E M S O I E N L S O E O O M W V
L V U U R H C E O D T M T M I N A E I
I A H O E P T N E A R R O G A N C E T
Y O N R I E R C M M A E F D G N W R I
W O R L D V I E W S E D A U O N S F C
H S R B E S N I S I H N I J N S U L U
R N E F I T A O J S R E L A T I V E S
Y E B O A R T R L E U R U N A A D A H
L O N G E V I T Y N E R R E N L D Y N
O S E E U C O N S E Q U E N C E S E I
N T O E O E N R T G T S I S E R R A U

ABSOLUTE	ARROGANCE	BLESSINGS
CONSEQUENCES	DECISIONS	DISOBEDIENCE
FAILURE	FAVOR	FREE WILL
GENESIS	GODS VIEW	GOMORRAH
HEART	HONOR	HUMAN
IMMORAL	INDOCTRINATION	JUDGMENT
LAW	LEVITICUS	LONGEVITY
NEW TESTAMENT	OBEY	OLD TESTAMENT
PEACE	PEER PRESSURE	REBELLION
RELATIVE	RESIST	ROMANS
SIN	SODOM	SURRENDER
VALUES	VIOLATION	WORLD VIEW

The Divine Order for Sexual Relationships
By Rev. Lorna Graham

Words associated with “The Divine Order For Sexual Relationships” are hidden. Can you find them all in 15 minutes?

A T M D L N U I S A F L I T A G R
 A H E M O R A L I T Y A A L M A G
 R U S A C R E D U N Y C M R M E I
 E S I M O R P M O C T T R Y N N E
 D B D V M N O I T A I V E D A E P
 R A O L P E S C O E L G E M T C D
 O N L D L R E L F O A R O H U I D
 L D A N E I O R O I U W E T R O I
 R A T V M C E N R B X D O H A H N
 O O R H E T E R O S E X U A L C Y
 N E Y U N U A P F H S D I V I N E
 P L L U T M E P T A O E I L K A O
 L O O A Y A D L I I M A G E E S D
 D C H V M E N L A N O I T C N U F
 P H S E L F E N O M H N L A E C I
 I N Y L P I T L U M E T M Y S O E
 N D E I B W S E L R A F L L S P E

CHOICE	COMPLEMENT	COMPROMISE
COUNTERFEIT	DECEPTION	DEVIATION
DIVINE	FAMILY	FEMALE
FUNCTIONAL	GENDER	HETEROSEXUAL
HOLY	HOMOSEXUALITY	HONOR
HUSBAND	IDOLATRY	IMAGE
LIKENESS	MALE	MAN
MARRIAGE	MORALITY	MULTIPLY
NATURAL	OBEDIENCE	ONE FLESH
ORDER	PERVERSION	SACRED
UNNATURAL	WIFE	WOMAN

God's Love and Saving Grace for Homosexuals **By Rev. Lorna Graham**

Words associated with "God's Love and Saving Grace For Homosexuals" are hidden.
 Can you find them all in 15 minutes?

S A L V A T I O N O I T P M E D E R
 R C D H W E F A V O R H T T S I C E
 C O R R L A U T I R I P S N U O A S
 N N E O N B A H T N E S O E B R R T
 S S E N S U O E T H G I R M A E G R
 R E D R O S I D C I T E N E G P R A
 T C L D A T I I H A A A I N V E T I
 M R S F O E M T I N B F C O S N H N
 E A U E D A R L O T U G T T E T O T
 I T D O G I I I O A N M O A L A L C
 S I O E B C S R Y I D R O A A N Y D
 C O X W N S B C L D A L S D W C S R
 H N E O E A R A I T N N H E E E P R
 O N C F E E E I I P T O R N N E I F
 E E N N M H L O B E L I E V E S R S
 R O P C H A N G E Y I I N I R A I F
 C E N O I T A M R O F S N A R T T I
 R O I F H A B R O K E N N E S S T R

ABUNDANT LIFE	ABUSE	ATONEMENT
BELIEVE	BROKENNESS	CHANGE
CONFESSION	CONSECRATION	CONVERSION
CROSS	EXODUS	FAITH
FAVOR	FREEDOM	GENETIC DISORDER
GRACE	HEALING	HOLY
HOLY SPIRIT	HOPE	IMAGE
MERCY	NEW BIRTH	RECONCILIATION
REDEMPTION	RENEWAL	REPENTANCE
RESTORATION	RESTRAINT	RIGHTEOUSNESS
SALVATION	SELF DISCIPLINE	SPIRITUAL
TRANSFORMATION		

APPENDIX 2

QUESTIONNAIRE

Doctor of Ministry Thesis-project Design Questionnaire Assessment Instrument

This document is distributed to all seminar attendees.

Dear Friends,

I am a doctoral candidate at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary. My thesis, *How to Preach to Youth Concerning Homosexual Practice in a Tolerant World*, requires your participation by filling out the following survey, a requisite in order to fulfill the Doctor of Ministry program.

Your participation will help me gain feedback on my presentation and survey your feelings concerning the issue of homosexuality. This is important as my desire is to be honest, candid and relevant in communicating the Good News in this 21st century.

The questionnaire is confidential. Your identity is not required. Your response does not impact my grade.

Seminar Evaluation Form

Lecturer _____ *Evaluator _____ (optional)

Please choose from the following for your answer:

(1) Strongly Agree (2) Agree (3) Strongly Disagree (4) Disagree (5) Undecided

A. Organizational Structure

Introduction

1. _____ The introduction seized my attention.
2. _____ The introduction speaks to a current need.
3. _____ The introduction was the right length.
4. _____ The introduction oriented the listener to the first point.
5. _____ The introduction engaged me to hear more.

Structure

6. _____ The seminar objective was established.
7. _____ There was smooth transition and progression throughout.
8. _____ The transitions introduced the next point.

Conclusion

9. _____ I gained clear understanding of God's Word.
10. _____ The seminar affirmed my faith convictions.
11. _____ The seminar has challenged me to take action.
12. _____ The seminar purpose was accomplished.

B. Content

13. _____ The seminar was built on sound exegesis
14. _____ The preacher showed exactly where she was in the text.
15. _____ The preacher was comfortable with the text.
16. _____ The seminars content showed originality.
17. _____ The seminars are relevant to what people are experiencing today.
18. _____ The preacher was believable.
19. _____ Illustrations were clear and applicable to the seminar.

C. Style

23. _____ The preacher's vocabulary was too academic.
24. _____ Language was all inclusive (limited use of personal pronoun).
25. _____ The preacher used active verbs.

D. Delivery

32. _____ The dress attire was appropriate for the setting.
33. _____ I was distracted by the preacher's mannerisms.
34. _____ The preacher made eye contact during the seminars.
35. _____ The preacher had variation in pitch.
36. _____ Pause was effective.
37. _____ The preacher exhibited confidence.
38. _____ The preacher wanted to be heard.
39. _____ I would listen to this preacher again.

E. What is your overall rating of the seminar?

Dull	1	2	3	4	5	Interesting
Warm	1	2	3	4	5	Cold
Unclear	1	2	3	4	5	On Target
Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Excellent

Open-ended Questions

1. Have you assessed any weaknesses or strengths in the lecture materials? If so, please give a full description.
2. Given the title, substance and presentation of each seminar do you believe they have a youth appeal or do they attract a more general/mature listening audience?
3. Identify any part(s) of the lecture that waves a “red flag” whether biblically or rhetorically.
4. What do you think about the organization and flow of the lecture?
5. In what ways do you think the lecture would make an impact on:
 - a. Youth culture?
 - b. Pastors?
 - c. Homosexuals?
 - d. Families of homosexuals?
6. Were the lecture outline and the exposition of the scriptures 100 percent faithful to the biblical text? Please point out any error. Recommend any solutions.
7. How do you feel God’s love was communicated?
8. If you had the responsibility of writing a sermon or seminar manuscript in opposition to the homosexual agenda how differently would you approach the issue at hand and what texts would you choose?
9. Does the lecture material serve as models for pastors and collegiate as to how to communicate the Good News to those who are bound in homosexual practice?

Thank you for you participation in this study. Please hand the survey to an usher. You may contact Rev. Lorna Graham through her email, if you wish to make further comments. The email address is heart2heartmin@aol.com.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AIDS. <http://www.aidsonline.com> (accessed March 6, 2012).

Alexander, Robert and James Donaldson, eds. *The writings of the fathers down to A.D. 325*. in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 5 sec. 1. Rev. ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.

Altman, Dennis. *Homosexual Oppression and Liberation*. New York, NY: Outerbridge and Dienstfrey, 1971.

American Psychiatric Association. "Position Statement on Homosexuality and Civil Rights." *American Journal of Psychiatry* 131, no. 4 (April 1974).

Apperson, L. B. and W. G. McDoo, Jr. "Parental Factors in the Childhood of Homosexuals." *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 73, (1968).

Bailey, Derrick. *Homosexuality And The Western Christian Tradition*. London, England: Longmans, 1955.

Bancroft, John. "Homosexual Orientation." *British Journal of Psychiatry* 164, (1994).

Barker, Kenneth, ed. *The NIV Study Bible*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1995.

Barnhouse, Ruth. *Homosexuality: A Symbolic Confusion*. New York, NY: Seabury, 1977.

Batchelor, E., Jr. "Homosexuality and the Homosexual" in *Homosexuality and Ethics*. Edited by Robert Gordis. New York, NY: Pilgrim, 1980.

Bene, E. "On the Genesis of Male Homosexuality: An Attempt at Clarifying the Role of the Parents." *British Journal of Psychiatry* 111, (1965).

Bieber, Irving. *Homosexuality: A Psychoanalytical Study*, New York, NY: Basic Books, 1962.

Boswell, John. *Christianity, Social Tolerance and Homosexuality*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Brooks, B. A. "Fertility Cult Functionaries in the Old Testament," *JBL* 60 (1941).

Brown, Francis, et al. *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2000.

- Brueggemann, Walter. *Genesis Interpretation*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2010.
- Buchanan, Wyatt. *San Francisco Chronicle*. "Los Altos City Council OKs gay pride parade." (May 11, 2006) <http://www.sfgate.com> (accessed February 3, 2012).
- Byne, William. "The Biological Evidence Challenged." *Scientific American* (1994).
- Camenker, Brian, and Scott Whiteman. *Massachusetts News*. The FISTGATE Report. "Governor's Commission Lies Again About Safety and Suicide." http://www.massnews.com/past_issues/other/govcm2.htm (accessed February 3, 2012).
- . *Massachusetts News*. The FISTGATE Report. "Students Given Graphic Instruction In Homosexual Sex." http://www.massnews.com/past_issues/2000/Schools/fistrep.htm (accessed February 3, 2012).
- Caprio, Frank. *Female Homosexuality*. New York, NY: Citadel, 1954.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. "HIV/AIDS Among Youth." <http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/resources/factsheets/PDF/youth.pdf> (accessed February 3, 2012).
- . "HIV and Young Men Who Have Sex With Men." (June 2011) http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/sexualbehaviors/pdf/hiv_factsheet_ymsm.pdf (accessed February 3, 2012).
- . "Increases in Unsafe Sex and Rectal Gonorrhea Among Men Who Have Sex With Men, San Francisco, California, 1994-1997." *MMWR* 48, no. 3 (January 1999): 45-48. <http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/00056314.htm> (accessed February 3, 2012).
- Cloud, John. "The Battle Over Gay Teens." *Time*, October 10, 2005.
- Countryman, William L. "The Bible, Heterosexism, and the American Public Discussion of Sexual Orientation" in *God Forbid*, edited by Kathleen M. Sands. New York, NY: Oxford University, 2000.
- The Courage Apostolate. <http://www.couragerc.net> (accessed March 14, 2012).
- Dancey, Christine. "The Influence of Familial and Personality Variables on Sexual Orientation in Women." *Psychological Record* 40, no. 3 (1990).

- Danker, Frederick, ed. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago, 2000.
- Deferrari, Roy, ed. "Clement Of Alexandria: Christ the Educator" in *The Fathers Of The Church*. Translated by Simon P. Wood. New York, NY: Fathers Of The Church, Inc., 1954.
- Dobson, James. *Dr. Dobson Answers Your Questions*. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 1980.
- Ellis, Havelock. "The Nature of Sexual Inversion." *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*. Volume II. New York, NY: Random House, 1936.
- Evans, Ray. "Parental Relationships and Homosexuality." *Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality* (1971).
- Exodus International. <http://www.exodus-international.org> (accessed March 14, 2012)
- Ford, Cellan, and Frank Beach. *Patterns of Sexual Behavior*. New York, NY: Harper & Brothers, 1951.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Letters of Sigmund Freud 1873-1938*. London, England: Hogarth Press, 1961.
- . *Three Contributions to the Theory of Sex*. 4th Edition. New York, NY: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1970.
- Gagnon, John H., and William Simon. *Sexual Conduct*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Press, 1973.
- Gay, Lesbian Medical Association, The. <http://www.glma.org> (accessed March 7, 2012).
- Gay Student Alliance. <http://www.gsanetwork.org/about-us> (accessed March 7, 2012).
- Gonsiorek, John, "Results of Psychological Testing on Homosexual Populations." *The American Behavioral Scientist* 25, no. 4 (1982).
- Greenblatt, D. "Semantic differential analysis of the Triangular System hypothesis in adjusted male homosexuals." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of California, Los Angeles. 1966.
- Grenz, Stanley. *Welcoming But Not Affirming*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998.

- Gundlach, Ralph. "Childhood Parental Relationships and the Establishment of Gender Roles of Homosexuals." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 33, no. 2 (1969).
- Haldeman, Douglas. "The Pseudo-science of Sexual Orientation Conversion Therapy." *ANGLES: The Policy Journal of the Institute for Gay and Lesbian Strategic Studies* 4, no. 1 (1999).
- Hamer, Dean, et al. "A Linkage Between DNA Markers on the X Chromosome and Male Sexual Orientation." *Science* 261, no. 5119 (1993).
- Hamilton, Victor. *The New International Commentary on the Old Testament: The Book of Genesis Chapters 18-50*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Helminiak, Daniel. *What the Bible Really Says About Homosexuality*. San Francisco, CA: Alamo Square, 1994.
- Hirschfeld, Magnus. *Die Homosexualitat*. Berlin, Germany: L. Marcus, 1920.
- Hoffner, Harry A., Jr. "Symbols for Masculinity and Femininity: Their Use In Ancient Near Eastern Sympathetic Magic Rituals." *JBL* 85 (1966).
- Hooker, Evelyn. "The Adjustment of the Male Overt Homosexual," *Journal of Projective Techniques* 21 (1957).
- . "Parental Relations and Male Homosexuality in Patient and Nonpatient Samples." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 33, no. 2 (1969).
- Horner, Tom. *Jonathan Loved David: Homosexuality in Biblical Times*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1978.
- Josephus IV. *Jewish Antiquities, Books I-IV, 194-195*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. London, England: William Heinemann Ltd, 1930.
- Kaufmann, Gershen. *Coming Out of Shame*. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1996.
- Kinsey, Alfred. *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*. Philadelphia, PA: W. B. Saunders, 1948.
- Kinsey Institute, The. <http://www.kinseyinstitute.org> (accessed February 3, 2012).
- Krafft-Ebing, Richard Von. *Psychopathia Sexualis*. New York, NY: Stein and Day, 1965.
- LeVay, Simon. "A Difference in Hypothalamic Structure Between Heterosexual and Homosexual Men." *Science, New Series* 253, no. 5023 (1991).

- Lovelace, Richard. *Homosexuality and the Church*. Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1978.
- Martin, Allie, and Jody Brown. "9th Circuit: Parents Have No 'Fundamental Rights' In Their Children's Sex Ed." *AgapePress* (November 3, 2005).
- Massachusetts Department of Education. 2001 Youth Risk Behavior Survey Results. <http://www.doe.mass.edu/cnp/hprogrms/yrbs/01/results.pdf> (accessed February 3, 2012).
- Mehta, Seema. "Gay Teens Are Using The System." *Los Angeles Times*, B.1. (March 12, 2006). <http://www.articles.latimes.com/2006/mar/12/local/me-gayteens12> (accessed February 3, 2012).
- Michael, Robert, John H. Gagnon, Edward O. Laumann and Gina Kolata. *Sex in America: A Definitive Survey*. New York, NY: Little Brown and Co., 1994.
- Morris, J.B. and John H. Parker, trans. *The Homilies of S. John Chrysostom*. London, England: Oxford, 1841.
- National Adoption Information Clearing House, "Gay and Lesbian Adoptive Parents: Resources for Professionals and Parents." http://www.childwelfare.gov/pubs/f_gay/f_gay.pdf (accessed February 3, 2012).
- National Cancer Institute. <http://www.cancer.gov> (accessed February 3, 2012).
- National Geographic. <http://www.ngm.nationalgeographic.com> (accessed February 3, 2012).
- National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences. <http://www.niehs.nih.gov> (accessed February 3, 2012).
- Neill, James. *The Origins and Role of Same-Sex Relationships in Human Societies*. North Carolina: Mcfarland, 2009.
- Neusner, Jacob. *Confronting Creation: How Judaism Reads Genesis*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1991.
- Nicolosi, Joseph, and Linda Nicolosi. *A Parent's Guide to Preventing Homosexuality*. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2002.
- Nissinen, Martti. *Homoeroticism in the Biblical World*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1998.

- Pattison, Mansell E., and Myrna Pattison. "Ex-Gays: Religiously Mediated Change in Homosexuals." *American Journal of Psychiatry* 137, no. 12 (December 1980).
- Rado, Sandor. *Psychoanalysis of Behavior Collected Papers*, volumes I & II. New York, NY: Grune & Stratton, 1962.
- Reisman, Judith, and Edward Eichel. *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud*. Lafayette, LA: Huntington House, 1990.
- Rice, George, et al. "Male Homosexuality: Absence of Linkage to Microsatellite Markers Xq28." *Science* 284 (1999).
- Risch, Neil, et al. "Male Sexual Orientation and Genetic Evidence." *Science* 262, no. 5142 (1993).
- Robinson, Haddon. *Biblical Preaching*, 2nd Edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2001.
- Rogers, Patrick. "How Many gays are there?" *Newsweek*, February 15, 1993.
- Satinover, Jeffrey. "A Cluster of Influences." *Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth*. Grand Rapids, MI: Hamewith Books, 1996.
- Schmalz, Jeffrey. "Survey Stirs Debate on Number of Gay Men in U.S." *New York Times*, April 16, 1993.
- Sheldon, Louis P. "Homosexuals Recruit Public School Children." *Traditional Values* 18, no. 11. http://www.traditionalvalues.org/pdf_files/TVCSpecialRptHomosexualRecruitChildren.PDF (accessed February 3, 2012).
- Socarides, Charles. *The Preoedipal Psychoanalytic Therapy of Sexual Perversions*. Madison, WI: International Universities Press, 1988.
- Spong, John Shelby. *Rescuing the Bible from Fundamentalism: A Bishop Rethinks the Meaning of Scripture*. San Francisco, CA: Harper, 1991.
- Stoddard, Tom. "The Homosexual Numbers." *Newsweek*, March 22, 1993.
- Stoller, Robert. "Overview: The Impact of New Advances in Sex Research on Psychoanalytic Theory." *American Journal of Psychiatry* 130 (1973).
- Stoller, Robert, et al. "A Symposium: Should Homosexuality Be in the APA Nomenclature?" *American Journal of Psychiatry* 130, no. 11 (November 1973): 1207-1216.

- Traditional Values Coalition. <http://www.traditionalvalues.org> (accessed March 14, 2012).
- Van den Aardweg, Gerald J. M. "Parents of Homosexuals—Not Guilty? Interpretation of Childhood Psychological Data," *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, vol. 38, no 2, 1984.
- Von Rad, Gerhard. *Genesis, A Commentary*. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster, 1956.
- Wansbrough, Henry, ed. *The New Jerusalem Bible*. New York, NY: DoubleDay, 1999.
- Wenham, Gordon J. *Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 2, Genesis 16-50*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1994.
- White, Mel. *Stranger at the Gate*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster, 1994.
- . *What the Bible Says and Does Not Say about Homosexuality*. Lynchburg, VA. <http://www.soulforce.org> (accessed March 14, 2012).
- Williams, Craig. *Roman Sexuality*. London, England: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- WorldNetDaily.com. "TV show depicts teen gay romance -- Mainstream, youth-oriented program breaks new ground." <http://www.wnd/2004/01/22899> (accessed February 3, 2012).
- Wyden, Peter, and Barbara Wyden. *Growing Up Straight: What Every Thoughtful Parent Should Know About Homosexuality*. New York, NY: Stein Day, 1968.
- Zmuda, Richard A. "Rising Rates of Anal Cancer for Gay Men," *Cancer News* (August 17, 2000). http://www.cancerlinksusa.com/cancernews_sm/Aug2000/081700analcancer (accessed February 3, 2012).
- Zodhiates, Spiros. *Hebrew-Greek Key Word Study Bible*. La Habra, CA: AMG, 1990.

VITA

Name: Lorna P. Graham

Place of Birth: Jamaica, West Indies

Date of Birth: 19 May 1966

B.S. (Accounting), Northeastern University (Boston, Massachusetts)

M.Div., Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary (South Hamilton, Massachusetts)

D.Min. (The Preacher and the Message), Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary
(South Hamilton, Massachusetts)

Period of Studies: May 2006-May 2012

Expected Graduation: May 2012